

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	1	<u>Raised by:</u>	Dave Sanford	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	4.2	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Add definitions/concepts related to data exchange	<u>Class'n:</u>	Minor technical
----------------------------	---	------------------------	-----------------

Description

Include the following definitions/concepts:

1. data exchange requires a contract between exchange partners which defines at the meta level the elements to be exchanged and a mechanism for measuring success
2. an exchange standard is a public exchange contract allowing a wide range of partners to readily participate

Therefore, the problem is to define what needs to be exchanged and the meta-model for it

Proposed resolution:

Actual resolution:

Text added to Introduction

Commentary

Implemented: N62 **Date resolved:** 03/01/96

<u>Issue number:</u>	2	<u>Raised by:</u>	Dave Sanford	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	4.2	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Update figure 1	<u>Class'n:</u>	Minor technical
----------------------------	-----------------	------------------------	-----------------

Description

Either update figure 1 or include an additional figure – see “STEP on a page” diagram

Proposed resolution:

Actual resolution:

A variation on "STEP on a page" is included in N30.

Commentary

JPF: see, however, issue #13 w.r.t. including Mapping Table as an element of the diagram.
JPF: diagram appears as figure 3 (clause 7) in N30/N40.

Implemented: N30 **Date resolved:** 10/11/95

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	3	<u>Raised by:</u>	Bill Danner	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	6	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Sub-clause on mapping tables	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
<u>Description</u>	add a sub-clause on Mapping Tables to clause 6		
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>	Section (5.1.5) added in N22.		
<u>Commentary</u>	JPF: revised/updated text on mapping tables appears as 9.4.1 in N40.		
<u>Implemented:</u>	N22	<u>Date resolved:</u>	08/11/95

<u>Issue number:</u>	4	<u>Raised by:</u>	Bill Danner	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	6.6	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Change sub-clause title	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
<u>Description</u>	change the title of 6.6 to "Model Specifications"		
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>	Sub-clause added with this title (N22).		
<u>Commentary</u>			
<u>Implemented:</u>	N22	<u>Date resolved:</u>	08/11/95

<u>Issue number:</u>	5	<u>Raised by:</u>	Bill Danner	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	7.4	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Restructure clauses	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
<u>Description</u>	make 7.4 a separate clause (12) (within a separate section?) covering assumptions and requirements from data specifications (e.g., implementation schemas), "conceptual instances", implementation forms		
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>	Separate clause on Implementation Principles added, with content as proposed.		
<u>Commentary</u>	This is clause 18 in N62		
<u>Implemented:</u>	N22	<u>Date resolved:</u>	08/11/95

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	8	<u>Raised by:</u>	Bill Danner	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	3	<u>Status:</u>	transferred

<u>Issue title:</u>	Definition of "Application Protocol"	<u>Class'n:</u>	editorial
<u>Description</u>			
The definition of Application Protocol: should also include AAM, ARM, and mapping table [issue on Part 1]			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>			
Issue transferred to Part 1 amendment project			
<u>Commentary</u>			
JPF: Definition changed as proposed in N22 (and therefore marked as closed).			
JPF: N30 reverts to reference to the Part 1 definition only.			
JPF: issue reopened and to be passed to Part 1 amendment project (H Mason)			
<u>Implemented:</u>		<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/19/96

<u>Issue number:</u>	11	<u>Raised by:</u>	Bill Danner	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	4.2	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Fundamental principles	<u>Class'n:</u>	major technical
<u>Description</u>			
Include in 4.2:			
- multiple views (projections) of a product over the entire life-cycle			
- aggregations of characteristics with multiple representations			
- application context is functionally determined			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>			
Principles are covered in Clauses 5, 9 and 10.			
<u>Commentary</u>			
JPF: Proposed text added in N22 (previous clause 4, moved to Introduction in N22).			
JPF: I have reopened this issue since the relevant text (or equivalent) no longer exists in N40.			
JPF/JO: This form of words is not used precisely. The term "view" is overloaded.			
<u>Implemented:</u>	N62	<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/01/96

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	13	<u>Raised by:</u>	Bill Danner	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	4.3	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Update figure 1	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
<u>Description</u>	page 10, figure 1: update to include mapping table		
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>	Diagram updated as suggested.		
<u>Commentary</u>			
<u>Implemented:</u>	N62	<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/01/96

<u>Issue number:</u>	18	<u>Raised by:</u>	Bill Danner	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	5.2	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Use of an integration framework	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
<u>Description</u>	page 15, second paragraph: second rationale (first is traceability of data to product)		
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>	Covered in clauses 5.2.2 (f) and 5.3.2 (g)		
<u>Commentary</u>			
<u>Implemented:</u>	N62	<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/01/96

<u>Issue number:</u>	19	<u>Raised by:</u>	Bill Danner	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	5.2	<u>Status:</u>	obsolete

<u>Issue title:</u>	Existence dependence and stability	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
<u>Description</u>	page 15, second paragraph: existence dependency does not of itself provide stability		
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>			
<u>Commentary</u>	Text referred to no longer exists.		
<u>Implemented:</u>		<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/19/96

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	20	<u>Raised by:</u>	Bill Danner	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	5.3.3	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Integration and modularity	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
<u>Description</u>	5.3.3, point 1: this aspect of the method provides for modularity		
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>	Addressed by clause 15.		
<u>Commentary</u>			
<u>Implemented:</u>	N62	<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/01/96

<u>Issue number:</u>	23	<u>Raised by:</u>	Bill Danner	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	5.3.6	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	AICs and shared IR constructs	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
<u>Description</u>	5.3.6, last paragraph: explain how AICs are "... not intended to identify all shared IR constructs ..."		
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>	Addressed by clause 16.1, note 2.		
<u>Commentary</u>			
<u>Implemented:</u>	N62	<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/01/96

<u>Issue number:</u>	25	<u>Raised by:</u>	Bill Danner	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	6.2, 6.3	<u>Status:</u>	unpersuasive

<u>Issue title:</u>	ARM and domain ontologies	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
<u>Description</u>	6.2/6.3: introduce the idea that the ARM specifies a domain ontology		
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>			
<u>Commentary</u>	The use of "new" terms such as this is deprecated for Part 13.		
<u>Implemented:</u>		<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/19/96

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	26	<u>Raised by:</u>	Bill Danner	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	6.3, 6.7	<u>Status:</u>	open

<u>Issue title:</u>	Consistent use of "AIM".	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
<u>Description</u> Ensure consistent use of AIM as a term: in the AP document, the AIM consists of the short form EXPRESS (with associated textual definitions) plus the mapping table			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>			
<u>Commentary</u> Left open for Qualification review of consistency.			
<u>Implemented:</u>	<u>Date resolved:</u>		

<u>Issue number:</u>	27	<u>Raised by:</u>	Bill Danner	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	6.4	<u>Status:</u>	unpersuasive

<u>Issue title:</u>	IRs and abstract cognitive models	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
<u>Description</u> 6.4: introduce that idea that the IRs are an abstract cognitive model			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>			
<u>Commentary</u> The use of "new" terms such as this is deprecated for Part 13.			
<u>Implemented:</u>	<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/19/96	

<u>Issue number:</u>	31	<u>Raised by:</u>	Bill Danner	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	7.2, 7.3	<u>Status:</u>	obsolete

<u>Issue title:</u>	IRs are not just a vocabulary	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
<u>Description</u> 7.2/7.3: IRs are not (just) a vocabulary; rather, they are a vocabulary and a grammar that together constitute an abstract cognitive model			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>			
<u>Commentary</u> Text referred to no longer exists.			
<u>Implemented:</u>	<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/19/96	

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	33	<u>Raised by:</u>	Bill Danner	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	7.3	<u>Status:</u>	unpersuasive
<u>Issue title:</u>	ARM and domain ontologies				<u>Class'n:</u> minor technical
<u>Description</u>	7.3, first paragraph: ARM is an application-specific domain ontology				
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>					
<u>Actual resolution:</u>					
<u>Commentary</u>	The use of "new" terms such as this is deprecated for Part 13.				
<u>Implemented:</u>		<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/19/96		
<u>Issue number:</u>	34	<u>Raised by:</u>	Bill Danner	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	7.3.2	<u>Status:</u>	unpersuasive
<u>Issue title:</u>	AAM and Industrial Application Context				<u>Class'n:</u> minor technical
<u>Description</u>	7.3.2, Industrial Application Context: this is specified by the entire AAM, i.e., it includes the "out of scope" activities and flows				
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>					
<u>Actual resolution:</u>					
<u>Commentary</u>	The terms "industrial application context", "industrial application context" are no longer used.				
<u>Implemented:</u>		<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/19/96		
<u>Issue number:</u>	35	<u>Raised by:</u>	Bill Danner	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	7.3.2	<u>Status:</u>	unpersuasive
<u>Issue title:</u>	AAM and Industrial Application Scope				<u>Class'n:</u> minor technical
<u>Description</u>	7.3.2, Industrial Application Scope: selected elements of AAM for AP				
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>					
<u>Actual resolution:</u>					
<u>Commentary</u>	The terms "industrial application context", "industrial application context" are no longer used.				
<u>Implemented:</u>		<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/19/96		

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	36	<u>Raised by:</u>	Bill Danner	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	7.3.3	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Specific attempted taxonomies	<u>Class'n:</u>	editorial
<u>Description</u>			
7.3.3: delete references to specific attempted taxonomies for APs			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>			
References deleted as proposed (N22, 6.3.3)			
<u>Commentary</u>			
<u>Implemented:</u>	N22	<u>Date resolved:</u>	08/11/95

<u>Issue number:</u>	37	<u>Raised by:</u>	Bill Danner	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	7.3.5.1	<u>Status:</u>	unpersuasive

<u>Issue title:</u>	Consistent description of AICs	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
<u>Description</u>			
7.3.5.1: must be described consistent with standard data elements (data architecture). IRs = underlying semantics (abstract cognitive model). Any application view be can represented using the abstract cognitive model.			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>			
<u>Commentary</u>			
See issues 11 and 27. The issue itself is valid (and is in fact addressed by clause 11), but resolution to previous issues has deprecated use of terminology proposed.			
<u>Implemented:</u>		<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/19/96

<u>Issue number:</u>	39	<u>Raised by:</u>	Bill Danner	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	7.3.4.2	<u>Status:</u>	obsolete

<u>Issue title:</u>	IRs are not just a vocabulary	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
<u>Description</u>			
7.3.4.2: NO! the IRs are not a vocabulary (see also issue #31). Also, "abstract" and "fuzzy" are not synonyms.			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>			
<u>Commentary</u>			
Text referred to no longer exists.			
<u>Implemented:</u>		<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/19/96

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	40	<u>Raised by:</u>	Bill Danner	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	7.3.5.3	<u>Status:</u>	closed
<u>Issue title:</u>	Inappropriate writing style for a standard				<u>Class'n:</u> editorial
<u>Description</u>	7.3.5.3: this section is written more like a "white paper" than a Reference Manual				
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>					
<u>Actual resolution:</u>	This section was removed between N22 and N30.				
<u>Commentary</u>					
<u>Implemented:</u>	N30	<u>Date resolved:</u>	10/11/95		
<u>Issue number:</u>	42	<u>Raised by:</u>	Bill Danner	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	7.3.2	<u>Status:</u>	open
<u>Issue title:</u>	Distinction between context and domain				<u>Class'n:</u> minor technical
<u>Description</u>	Context = real world circumstances in which something is done Domain = processes, knowledge and "agents" that produce something in a context				
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>					
<u>Actual resolution:</u>					
<u>Commentary</u>	Left open for Qualification review: consistent use of "context" and "domain"				
<u>Implemented:</u>					
<u>Date resolved:</u>					
<u>Issue number:</u>	43	<u>Raised by:</u>	Bill Danner	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	7.4.2.1	<u>Status:</u>	obsolete
<u>Issue title:</u>	Necessity of background knowledge				<u>Class'n:</u> minor technical
<u>Description</u>	7.4.2.1, third bullet on page 31: background knowledge is necessary for correct inferences (use of data).				
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>					
<u>Actual resolution:</u>					
<u>Commentary</u>	Text referred to no longer exists.				
<u>Implemented:</u>					
<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/19/96				

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	44	<u>Raised by:</u>	Bill Danner	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	7.4.2.1	<u>Status:</u>	closed
<u>Issue title:</u>	Data communication and data integration				<u>Class'n:</u> editorial
<u>Description</u>	7.4.2.1: use agreed terminology to distinguish between data communication and data integration				
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>					
<u>Actual resolution:</u>	CLause 5.1.4 identifies requirements in terms of accepted (Part 1) terminology.				
<u>Commentary</u>	JPF/JO: We have agreed that Part 13 uses the language of Part 1, and that consideration of the wider issues of data communication/integration is part of WG10's future work.				
<u>Implemented:</u>		<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/19/96		
<u>Issue number:</u>	45	<u>Raised by:</u>	Matthew West	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	11.3.2.3	<u>Status:</u>	closed
<u>Issue title:</u>	Addition of IR constructs				<u>Class'n:</u> major technical
<u>Description</u>	11.3.2.3: adding constructs rather than changing the architecture may result in requirements not being met.				
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>					
<u>Actual resolution:</u>	Text added as proposed: clause 5.1.17, note 5.				
<u>Commentary</u>					
<u>Implemented:</u>	N62	<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/01/96		
<u>Issue number:</u>	47	<u>Raised by:</u>	Matthew West	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	Introduction	<u>Status:</u>	unpersuasive
<u>Issue title:</u>	Rationale requires historical perspective				<u>Class'n:</u> editorial
<u>Description</u>	Introduction, purposes of Part 13: the rationale generally requires an historical perspective (especially for something pragmatic)				
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>					
<u>Actual resolution:</u>					
<u>Commentary</u>	WG10/P1 has agreed that the goal of *this* document is a statement of the "as-is" architecture and methodology. Other document(s) are required to provide the historical perspective.				
<u>Implemented:</u>		<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/19/96		

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	48	<u>Raised by:</u>	Matthew West	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	1	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Scope of Part 13	<u>Class'n:</u>	major technical
<u>Description</u>			
The first bullet of the scope implies that Part 13 covers all development of data standards in SC4 - not just STEP APs.			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>			
Scope is now limited to architecture and methodology of ISO 10303.			
<u>Commentary</u>			
<u>Implemented:</u>	N30	<u>Date resolved:</u>	10/11/95

<u>Issue number:</u>	49	<u>Raised by:</u>	Matthew West	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	4	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Placement and length of Executive Summary	<u>Class'n:</u>	editorial
<u>Description</u>			
Executive Summary. Comes first. Most executives won't get this far! Almost by definition this must be free standing. It may repeat or summarise material elsewhere. Our rule is maximum of 1 page!			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>			
Use of ISO Directives, SC4 Supplementary Directive precludes an explicit "Executive Summary". The relevant content is given in the Foreword and Introduction.			
<u>Commentary</u>			
<u>Implemented:</u>	N30	<u>Date resolved:</u>	10/11/95

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	50	<u>Raised by:</u>	Matthew West	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	5	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Objectives, purpose and requirements	<u>Class'n:</u>	editorial
----------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------	-----------

Description

Clause 5: this clause covers purpose and requirements as well as objectives. Either the title or the content of the clause should change.

Proposed resolution:

Actual resolution:

Issue is obsolete - relevant text has been removed.

Commentary

JPF: this issue is obsolete (text revised/replaced in later versions of the document).

Implemented: N30 **Date resolved:** 10/11/95

<u>Issue number:</u>	51	<u>Raised by:</u>	Matthew West	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	5.1	<u>Status:</u>	deferred

<u>Issue title:</u>	Objectives vs. achievements	<u>Class'n:</u>	major technical
----------------------------	-----------------------------	------------------------	-----------------

Description

5.1: is the provision of "... standard data specifications for unambiguous communication of information ..." the primary objective of STEP, or more what has been achieved so far?

Proposed resolution:

Actual resolution:

Issue against the architecture/methodology, rather than its documentation. Refer to WG10.

Commentary

Implemented: **Date resolved:** 03/19/96

<u>Issue number:</u>	52	<u>Raised by:</u>	Matthew West	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	5.1	<u>Status:</u>	unpersuasive

<u>Issue title:</u>	Design principles result from choices made.	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
----------------------------	---	------------------------	-----------------

Description

5.1, second paragraph: change "demanded" to "lead to". It should be clear that the design principles (especially that related to context-dependent semantics) were choices that were made (or driven).

Proposed resolution:

Actual resolution:

Commentary

The proposed change makes the text self-justifying, and therefore inappropriate to a standard.

Implemented: **Date resolved:** 03/19/96

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	53	<u>Raised by:</u>	Matthew West	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	5.1.4	<u>Status:</u>	unpersuasive

<u>Issue title:</u>	Useability of STEP across an industry.	<u>Class'n:</u>	major technical
<u>Description</u>	5.1.4, first paragraph: NOT TRUE!		
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>			
<u>Commentary</u>	JPF: the relevant text in N62 is item (b) under 5.1.3. This *is* a fundamental assumption of the STEP architecture, i.e., that data exchange can be implemented based on well defined subsets of the whole standard.		
<u>Implemented:</u>	<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/19/96	

<u>Issue number:</u>	54	<u>Raised by:</u>	Matthew West	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	5.1.4	<u>Status:</u>	deferred

<u>Issue title:</u>	Viability of a single integrated standard.	<u>Class'n:</u>	major technical
<u>Description</u>	5.1.4, second paragraph: "... a single integrated communication standard is not a viable solution" – can this be demonstrated (proved)?		
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>	Issue against the architecture/methodology, rather than its documentation. Refer to WG10.		
<u>Commentary</u>	JPF: this was marked as "addressed by other issue resolutions" in N22. JPF: although the text against which this issue was raised no longer appears in the document, is this nonetheless one of the fundamental concepts/assumptions of STEP? If it is not in the document, how can it be challenged?		
<u>Implemented:</u>	<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/19/96	

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	55	<u>Raised by:</u>	Matthew West	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	5.2	<u>Status:</u>	open

<u>Issue title:</u>	Existence dependence and extensibility	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
<u>Description</u>			
5.2, second paragraph on page 15: what sort of existence dependence? data dependence? real-world? Current practice does not support extensibility			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>			
<u>Commentary</u>			
Left open for review by Qualification: definition and usage of "existence dependence".			
<u>Implemented:</u>	<u>Date resolved:</u>		

<u>Issue number:</u>	56	<u>Raised by:</u>	Matthew West	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	5.2	<u>Status:</u>	deferred

<u>Issue title:</u>	Centralised integration/interpretation resources	<u>Class'n:</u>	major technical
<u>Description</u>			
5.2, third paragraph on page 15: this is the biggest weakness of the current methodology			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>			
Issue against the architecture/methodology, not its documentation in Part 13. Refer to WG10.			
<u>Commentary</u>			
<u>Implemented:</u>	<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/19/96	

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	57	<u>Raised by:</u>	Matthew West	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	5.3	<u>Status:</u>	accepted

<u>Issue title:</u>	Historical perspective	<u>Class'n:</u>	editorial
----------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	-----------

Description

5.3: some historical perspective is very helpful (essential even) in understanding a methodology that has evolved to meet emerging requirements. However, most of this is not historical – just a statement of what is.

Proposed resolution:

Actual resolution:

WG10/P1 agreed in Dallas (January 1996) that supporting documentation (including the necessary source of historical perspective) should be identified in the Bibliography. Bibliography has to be brought up to date. Any voids in the documentation set to be identified.

Commentary

Agreed 3/19/96 that there will be a cover note to go with the CD, identifying other relevant documentation and their inter-relationships (possibly based on Adam Polly's viewfoil showing methods documentation elements).

<u>Implemented:</u>	<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/19/96
----------------------------	------------------------------	----------

<u>Issue number:</u>	59	<u>Raised by:</u>	Matthew West	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	5.3.2	<u>Status:</u>	transferred

<u>Issue title:</u>	What is a product?	<u>Class'n:</u>	major technical
----------------------------	--------------------	------------------------	-----------------

Description

5.3.2: what is a product (or what is not)?

Proposed resolution:

Actual resolution:

Transferred to Part 1 amendment project.

Commentary

<u>Implemented:</u>	<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/19/96
----------------------------	------------------------------	----------

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	60	<u>Raised by:</u>	Matthew West	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	5.3.2	<u>Status:</u>	deferred

<u>Issue title:</u>	Product definition and views.	<u>Class'n:</u>	major technical
<u>Description</u> 5.3.2: is a product definition a view of a product, or a view of the definition of a product. Text says the latter; should be the former.			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u> WG10 + others to develop more consistent documentation of product_definition.			
<u>Commentary</u> JPF: relevant text in N40 is Annex E. See also F. Metzger input (NIST AP Interoperability workshop, 6/95) on difference between "views" and "projections".			
<u>Implemented:</u>		<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/19/96

<u>Issue number:</u>	61	<u>Raised by:</u>	Matthew West	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	5.3.6	<u>Status:</u>	deferred

<u>Issue title:</u>	AP integration method	<u>Class'n:</u>	major technical
<u>Description</u> 5.3.6, first paragraph: there is a higher level missing ("integration" at the requirements/ARM level).			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u> Issue against the architecture/methodology, not its documentation in Part 13. Refer to WG10.			
<u>Commentary</u>			
<u>Implemented:</u>		<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/19/96

<u>Issue number:</u>	63	<u>Raised by:</u>	Matthew West	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	6.2, 4	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Executive Summary should not add new info.	<u>Class'n:</u>	editorial
<u>Description</u> 6.2, JPF comment: anything in the executive summary should draw from elsewhere.			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u> See resolution to issue #49.			
<u>Commentary</u> JPF: see also issues #49 and #123.			
<u>Implemented:</u>	N30	<u>Date resolved:</u>	10/11/95

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	64	<u>Raised by:</u>	Matthew West	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	7.3	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Repetition & different viewpoints.			<u>Class'n:</u>	editorial
<u>Description</u>	7.3: like most other sections this covers the whole architecture and methodology, from a perspective.				
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>					
<u>Actual resolution:</u>	Restructuring of the document (N30) is intended to eliminate repetition and to provide a single viewpoint.				
<u>Commentary</u>					
<u>Implemented:</u>	N30	<u>Date resolved:</u>	10/11/95		

<u>Issue number:</u>	65	<u>Raised by:</u>	Matthew West	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	7.3	<u>Status:</u>	obsolete

<u>Issue title:</u>	Innovation and uniqueness of AP concept			<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
<u>Description</u>	7.3, second paragraph: "... innovative and unique ..." – a big claim!				
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>					
<u>Actual resolution:</u>	Issue is obsolete - relevant text is no longer in the document.				
<u>Commentary</u>					
<u>Implemented:</u>	N30	<u>Date resolved:</u>	10/11/95		

<u>Issue number:</u>	66	<u>Raised by:</u>	Matthew West	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	7.3	<u>Status:</u>	open

<u>Issue title:</u>	Source of information requirements			<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
<u>Description</u>	7.3, third paragraph: are the information requirements given by clause 4.2 or the ARM?				
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>					
<u>Actual resolution:</u>					
<u>Commentary</u>	Left open: the normative statement of the requirements is clause 4.2. This is clearly stated in Part 1, AP Guidelines, Supplementary Directives and every AP! Does Part 13 need to say this as well? Left open for final review/decision by qualification (JPF 3/19/96)				
<u>Implemented:</u>		<u>Date resolved:</u>			

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	67	<u>Raised by:</u>	Matthew West	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	7.3.2	<u>Status:</u>	obsolete
<u>Issue title:</u>	Industry Application Scope and usage				<u>Class'n:</u> minor technical
<u>Description</u>	7.3.2, Industry Application Scope: this is a usage.				
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>					
<u>Actual resolution:</u>					
<u>Commentary</u>	Text referred to no longer exists.				
<u>Implemented:</u>	N30	<u>Date resolved:</u>	10/11/95		
<u>Issue number:</u>	68	<u>Raised by:</u>	Matthew West	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	7.3.3.1	<u>Status:</u>	obsolete
<u>Issue title:</u>	Use of taxonomies				<u>Class'n:</u> minor technical
<u>Description</u>	7.3.3.1: this is not thought through or justified				
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>					
<u>Actual resolution:</u>	Issue is obsolete - relevant text has been removed.				
<u>Commentary</u>					
<u>Implemented:</u>	N30	<u>Date resolved:</u>	10/11/95		
<u>Issue number:</u>	69	<u>Raised by:</u>	Phil Kennicott	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	Whole document	<u>Status:</u>	transferred
<u>Issue title:</u>	Terminology: exchange vs. communication				<u>Class'n:</u> editorial
<u>Description</u>	General: the function of STEP tends to be described as “communication”; the original functions were communication (of physical files), database access (or programming interface), and archiving. All are important, and all should appear in the manual. NIPDE adopted the term “data exchange” to embrace all three.				
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>					
<u>Actual resolution:</u>	Transfer to Part 1 amendment project.				
<u>Commentary</u>					
<u>Implemented:</u>		<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/19/96		

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	70	<u>Raised by:</u>	Phil Kennicott	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	5.2	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Meaning of "deep structure"	<u>Class'n:</u>	editorial
----------------------------	-----------------------------	------------------------	-----------

Description
Page 14: the term "deep structure" should be defined.

Proposed resolution:

Actual resolution:
Structural basis of integration is described in clause 15.1 (N62).

Commentary
JPF: term no longer appears in the document (N40). However, the idea of "deep structure integration" *is* fundamental to STEP and should, I think, be included. (Other SC4 WGs have a different understanding of "integration".)

<u>Implemented:</u>	N62	<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/01/96
----------------------------	-----	------------------------------	----------

<u>Issue number:</u>	71	<u>Raised by:</u>	Phil Kennicott	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	5.3.1	<u>Status:</u>	obsolete

<u>Issue title:</u>	Status of Tokyo IPIM	<u>Class'n:</u>	editorial
----------------------------	----------------------	------------------------	-----------

Description
Page 16, 5.3.1: The Tokyo IPIM was intended as a place holder, and was never to be implemented. While the observations are correct from the standpoint of a person not realising this, they are unfair to the editors of the IPIM.

Proposed resolution:

Actual resolution:
Issue obsolete: text referenced no longer appears in the document.

Commentary

<u>Implemented:</u>	N30	<u>Date resolved:</u>	10/11/95
----------------------------	-----	------------------------------	----------

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	72	<u>Raised by:</u>	Phil Kennicott	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	6.2	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Importance of the mapping table	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
<u>Description</u>			
Page 19, 6.2: Reference should be made to the mapping table, particularly in view of its importance, as brought out at the (WG10) workshop (on AP Interoperability - NIST 6/95).			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>			
Closed by resolution to issue #3.			
<u>Commentary</u>			
<u>Implemented:</u>	N22	<u>Date resolved:</u>	08/11/95

<u>Issue number:</u>	73	<u>Raised by:</u>	Phil Kennicott	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	7.3.3	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Context taxonomies	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
<u>Description</u>			
Page 24, 7.3.3: I question the value of a discussion of context taxonomies. It is unclear that they have had an effect on the standard. They rather appear to be only an artefact of our preparation process.			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>			
Issue is obsolete - relevant text has been removed			
<u>Commentary</u>			
<u>Implemented:</u>	N30	<u>Date resolved:</u>	10/11/95

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	74	<u>Raised by:</u>	Phil Kennicott	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	10.11	<u>Status:</u>	open

Issue title: Abstract test suite development **Class'n:** major technical

Description

Page 77, 10.11: A question has been raised in the US as to whether this section accurately represents the WG6 consensus.

Proposed resolution:

Actual resolution:

Issue is left open, but little more can be added to Part 13 until WG6 completes work on ATS Guidelines.

Commentary

JPF: what little remains on ATS (architectural element and development methods) -- clauses 12 and 17 in N40 -- should be reviewed by WG6 for completeness and correctness.

Implemented: **Date resolved:**

<u>Issue number:</u>	75	<u>Raised by:</u>	Bernd Wenzel	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	Cover page	<u>Status:</u>	obsolete

Issue title: Agreed purpose of the document. **Class'n:** editorial

Description

Abstract (cover page): the agreed purpose of the document is "Documentation of current Architecture and Methodologies". General suitability is neither agreed nor intended.

Proposed resolution:

Actual resolution:

Issue is obsolete - relevant text has been removed.

Commentary

Implemented: N30 **Date resolved:** 10/11/95

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	77	<u>Raised by:</u>	Bernd Wenzel	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	Introduction	<u>Status:</u>	deferred

<u>Issue title:</u>	Data sharing and archiving using APs	<u>Class'n:</u>	major technical
<u>Description</u> Page vi, third boxed note: This (data sharing and archiving using APs) was the intention and an initial requirement!			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u> Issue is with the architecture/methodology, not its documentation in Part 13. Refer to WG10.			
<u>Commentary</u> JPF: there are a number of other issues on the same topic, including #153 and #168. The general issue of exchange vs. sharing vs. archiving, and the degree to which STEP supports these, must still be regarded as open.			
<u>Implemented:</u>		<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/19/96

<u>Issue number:</u>	78	<u>Raised by:</u>	Bernd Wenzel	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	Introduction	<u>Status:</u>	obsolete

<u>Issue title:</u>	Purposes of Part 13	<u>Class'n:</u>	editorial
<u>Description</u> Page vi, fourth boxed note: Disagree!			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u> Issue is obsolete - relevant text has been removed.			
<u>Commentary</u>			
<u>Implemented:</u>	N30	<u>Date resolved:</u>	10/11/95

<u>Issue number:</u>	80	<u>Raised by:</u>	Bernd Wenzel	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	5.1.2	<u>Status:</u>	open

<u>Issue title:</u>	Effectiveness vs. efficiency.	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
<u>Description</u> Footnote 5, page 13: Effectiveness is a qualitative property, efficiency is a quantitative one. If a solution is not effective, its efficiency is undefined!			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>			
<u>Commentary</u> JPF: current document (N40) still uses "efficient" and "effective" w.r.t. data exchange. Need to check appropriate use of these terms. Left open for Qualification review.			
<u>Implemented:</u>		<u>Date resolved:</u>	

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

Issue number:	81	Raised by:	Bernd Wenzel	Date:	27-Jun-95
Document N:	13	Clause(s):	5.2	Status:	rejected
Issue title:	General "Interoperability" of APs			Class'n:	editorial
Description	5.2, boxed note on page 14: this was an axiom of the current methodology/architecture. Don't touch!				
Proposed resolution:					
Actual resolution:	See commentary.				
Commentary	JPF: The text given in N13 was not that intended by the author of this section (Yuhwei Yang) and was included only as the result of an editorial "cut and paste" error. The author's intended text is included in N22. JPF: Latest version (N40) no longer includes this specific text (neither N13 nor N22 versions).				
Implemented:		Date resolved:	08/11/95		
Issue number:	82	Raised by:	Bernd Wenzel	Date:	27-Jun-95
Document N:	13	Clause(s):	5.2	Status:	obsolete
Issue title:	Purpose of Part 13 - current practice			Class'n:	editorial
Description	5.2, boxed notes on page 15. First note: not at all, but it is current practice. Second note: Disagree! This model is to document where we are, not where we want to get to.				
Proposed resolution:					
Actual resolution:	Issue is obsolete - relevant text has been removed.				
Commentary					
Implemented:	N30	Date resolved:	10/11/95		
Issue number:	83	Raised by:	Bernd Wenzel	Date:	27-Jun-95
Document N:	13	Clause(s):	6.2	Status:	closed
Issue title:	Diagrammatic presentation of STEP architecture			Class'n:	editorial
Description	6.2, boxed note: I'd prefer a different presentation over a repetition.				
Proposed resolution:					
Actual resolution:	A single diagram is now given for the architectural components and their relationships (N40, figure 3 in clause 7).				
Commentary					
Implemented:	N30	Date resolved:	10/11/95		

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	84	<u>Raised by:</u>	Bernd Wenzel	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	7.3	<u>Status:</u>	obsolete

<u>Issue title:</u>	Limited set of IR constructs	<u>Class'n:</u>	editorial
<u>Description</u> 7.3, boxed note no. 2: change "This resolves ..." to "This is intended to resolve ...".			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u> Issue is obsolete - relevant text has been removed.			
<u>Commentary</u>			
<u>Implemented:</u>	N30	<u>Date resolved:</u>	10/11/95

<u>Issue number:</u>	85	<u>Raised by:</u>	Bernd Wenzel	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	7.3.3	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Examples of context taxonomies	<u>Class'n:</u>	editorial
<u>Description</u> 7.3.3, NOTE – irrelevant for the current status, exclude.			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u> Examples of context taxonomies deleted (resolution to issue #36)			
<u>Commentary</u>			
<u>Implemented:</u>	N22	<u>Date resolved:</u>	08/11/95

<u>Issue number:</u>	86	<u>Raised by:</u>	Bernd Wenzel	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	7.3.5.3	<u>Status:</u>	obsolete

<u>Issue title:</u>	ARM harmonization	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
<u>Description</u> 7.3.5.3: exclude, irrelevant for the current situation			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u> Issue is obsolete - relevant text has been removed.			
<u>Commentary</u>			
<u>Implemented:</u>	N30	<u>Date resolved:</u>	10/11/95

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	87	<u>Raised by:</u>	Bernd Wenzel	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	7.3.5.4	<u>Status:</u>	obsolete

<u>Issue title:</u>	AP interoperability	<u>Class'n:</u>	major technical
<u>Description</u>	7.3.5.4: exclude, not correct		
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>	Issue is obsolete - relevant text has been removed.		
<u>Commentary</u>			
<u>Implemented:</u>	N30	<u>Date resolved:</u>	10/11/95

<u>Issue number:</u>	88	<u>Raised by:</u>	Bernd Wenzel	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	10.1.2	<u>Status:</u>	obsolete

<u>Issue title:</u>	Development of ARM methodologies	<u>Class'n:</u>	editorial
<u>Description</u>	10.1.2, boxed note: document what we have, not what could be.		
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>	Issue is obsolete - relevant text has been removed.		
<u>Commentary</u>			
<u>Implemented:</u>	N30	<u>Date resolved:</u>	10/11/95

<u>Issue number:</u>	89	<u>Raised by:</u>	Bernd Wenzel	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	10.6.2	<u>Status:</u>	accepted

<u>Issue title:</u>	Mapping table syntax	<u>Class'n:</u>	editorial
<u>Description</u>	10.6.2, mapping table example (table 2): syntax definition and explanation should be given.		
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>	Include reference to latest Mapping Table Guidelines document (SC4 N367), which defines the syntax.		
<u>Commentary</u>			
<u>Implemented:</u>		<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/19/96

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	90	<u>Raised by:</u>	Bernd Wenzel	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	Annex B	<u>Status:</u>	obsolete

<u>Issue title:</u>	Reference federated databases	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
<u>Description</u>			
Annex B: add federated databases			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>			
Issue is obsolete - relevant text has been removed.			
<u>Commentary</u>			
<u>Implemented:</u>	N30	<u>Date resolved:</u>	10/11/95

<u>Issue number:</u>	91	<u>Raised by:</u>	Dave Sanford	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	General	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Structure of the document	<u>Class'n:</u>	editorial
<u>Description</u>			
Redundancies in the document structure:			
4. Executive summary with architecture and methodology overview			
5. Objectives (actually design guidelines of data architecture and methods overview)			
6. (Data) Architecture components			
7. Data Architecture			
More distinctly separate Architecture from Methods			
9. Is the beginning of the Methods section			
Add a higher layer under architecture, to include three points:			
• customer focus, i.e., scope, AAM, leading to:			
• data architecture, supporting:			
• an implementation architecture			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>			
Restructuring of the document (N30) is intended to eliminate repetition and to provide a single viewpoint.			
<u>Commentary</u>			
<u>Implemented:</u>	N30	<u>Date resolved:</u>	10/11/95

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	92	<u>Raised by:</u>	Dave Sanford	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	Introduction	<u>Status:</u>	rejected

<u>Issue title:</u>	Redundancy with Part 1	<u>Class'n:</u>	editorial
<u>Description</u> Introduction: second paragraph is redundant with Part 1. [Issue with Supplementary Directives?]			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u> This "boilerplate" text is required by the Supplementary Directives to be included in all ISO 10303 parts.			
<u>Commentary</u>			
<u>Implemented:</u>		<u>Date resolved:</u>	08/11/95

<u>Issue number:</u>	93	<u>Raised by:</u>	Dave Sanford	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	Introduction, 4	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Purpose of Part 13	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
<u>Description</u> Introduction, list of purposes: is it appropriate to a standard that the reference manual should "be a basis for improvement ..."? Same text, same issue in clause 4 (boxed note on p.8)			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u> Text of introduction has been revised.			
<u>Commentary</u>			
<u>Implemented:</u>	N62	<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/01/96

<u>Issue number:</u>	94	<u>Raised by:</u>	Dave Sanford	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	Introduction	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Describe the structure of the document	<u>Class'n:</u>	editorial
<u>Description</u> Introduction, last paragraph: state which chapters constitute the two sections – otherwise appears to be in conflict with 11 chapters which are the first level of decomposition in the table of contents			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u> Structure of the document is described in the Introduction.			
<u>Commentary</u> JPF: in N40, the Introduction (last paragraph) states that there are three sections, but describes only the first two. JPF: all three sections described in N62			
<u>Implemented:</u>	N62	<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/01/96

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	95	<u>Raised by:</u>	Dave Sanford	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	1	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Methods for AP implementation	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
<u>Description</u>	Scope, fourth bullet: good, but where?		
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>	Methods for AP implementation are described in clause 19 and annexes E.2 and L (N30).		
<u>Commentary</u>	JPF: this is clause 18 and annex D.2 in N40; annex L no longer exists.		
<u>Implemented:</u>	N30	<u>Date resolved:</u>	10/11/95

<u>Issue number:</u>	96	<u>Raised by:</u>	Dave Sanford	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	3	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Definition of AIC	<u>Class'n:</u>	editorial
<u>Description</u>	Definition of AIC: "a logical grouping of interpreted constructs that ..."		
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>	Definition changed in N22.		
<u>Commentary</u>			
<u>Implemented:</u>	N22	<u>Date resolved:</u>	08/11/95

<u>Issue number:</u>	97	<u>Raised by:</u>	Dave Sanford	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	3	<u>Status:</u>	transferred

<u>Issue title:</u>	Definition of application protocol	<u>Class'n:</u>	editorial
<u>Description</u>	Definition of AP: add "... and its relationship to industrial needs." [Issue against Part 1].		
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>	Transferred to Part 1 amendment project.		
<u>Commentary</u>	JPF: Definition changed as proposed in N22 (and therefore marked as closed). JPF: N30 reverts to reference to the Part 1 definition only. JPF: issue reopened and to be passed to Part 1 amendment project (H Mason)		
<u>Implemented:</u>		<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/01/96

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	100	<u>Raised by:</u>	Dave Sanford	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	3	<u>Status:</u>	transferred

<u>Issue title:</u>	Definition of conforming implementation	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
<u>Description</u>			
Definition of conforming implementation: discuss certification? I.e., certified to meet instead of satisfies.			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>			
Transferred to Part 31 (SEDS?)			
<u>Commentary</u>			
<u>Implemented:</u>		<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/19/96

<u>Issue number:</u>	101	<u>Raised by:</u>	Dave Sanford	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	3	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Definitions of EXPRESS and EXPRESS-G	<u>Class'n:</u>	editorial
<u>Description</u>			
Definitions of EXPRESS and EXPRESS-G: change to data specification language			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>			
<u>Commentary</u>			
JPF: change implemented in N22, but should be checked against the terminology of Parts 1 & 11			
<u>Implemented:</u>	N22	<u>Date resolved:</u>	08/11/95

<u>Issue number:</u>	102	<u>Raised by:</u>	Dave Sanford	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	3	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Definition of fail verdict.	<u>Class'n:</u>	editorial
<u>Description</u>			
Definition of fail (verdict): remove – verdict is sufficient; this is common English in the context of verdict. [Issue against Part 31]			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>			
Definition removed for N22.			
<u>Commentary</u>			
JPF: issue to be passed to WG6			
<u>Implemented:</u>	N22	<u>Date resolved:</u>	08/11/95

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	103	<u>Raised by:</u>	Dave Sanford	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	3	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Definition of inconclusive verdict	<u>Class'n:</u>	editorial
----------------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------	-----------

Description
Definition of inconclusive (verdict): remove – verdict is sufficient; this is common English in the context of verdict.
[Issue against Part 31]

Proposed resolution:

Actual resolution:
Definition removed for N22.

Commentary
JPF: issue to be passed to WG6

Implemented: N22 **Date resolved:** 08/11/95

<u>Issue number:</u>	104	<u>Raised by:</u>	Dave Sanford	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	3	<u>Status:</u>	transferred

<u>Issue title:</u>	Add definition of interpreted construct	<u>Class'n:</u>	editorial
----------------------------	---	------------------------	-----------

Description
Add a new definition.
Interpreted construct: the association of a resource construct with a specific need. It is the atomic element of an AIM or AIC, resulting from interpretation.

Proposed resolution:

Actual resolution:
Transferred to Part 1 amendment project.

Commentary
JPF: Definition as proposed included in N22, but does not appear in N30 or N40.
JPF: issue to be passed to Part 1 amendment project (H Mason)

Implemented: N22 **Date resolved:** 03/19/96

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	105	<u>Raised by:</u>	Dave Sanford	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	3	<u>Status:</u>	obsolete
<u>Issue title:</u>	Definition of ontology				<u>Class'n:</u> editorial
<u>Description</u>	Definition of ontology: change to "... classify a domain of discourse."				
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>					
<u>Actual resolution:</u>	Text referred to is no longer in the document.				
<u>Commentary</u>					
<u>Implemented:</u>	N30	<u>Date resolved:</u>	10/11/95		
<u>Issue number:</u>	106	<u>Raised by:</u>	Dave Sanford	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	3	<u>Status:</u>	transferred
<u>Issue title:</u>	Definition of pass verdict.				<u>Class'n:</u> editorial
<u>Description</u>	Definition of pass (verdict): remove – verdict is sufficient; this is common English in the context of verdict. [Issue against Part 31]				
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>					
<u>Actual resolution:</u>	Definition deleted from N22. Issue transferred to Part 31 (SEDS?).				
<u>Commentary</u>					
<u>Implemented:</u>	N22	<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/19/96		
<u>Issue number:</u>	107	<u>Raised by:</u>	Dave Sanford	<u>Date:</u>	25-Jun-97
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	3	<u>Status:</u>	transferred
<u>Issue title:</u>	Definition of pre- and post-processor				<u>Class'n:</u> editorial
<u>Description</u>	Definitions of pre-processor and post processor: change 'internal format of a particular computer system' to 'some other private format'. Even 'private' is questionable, e.g., IGES to STEP. [Issue against Part 31]				
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>					
<u>Actual resolution:</u>	Definition deleted from N30. Issue transferred to Part 31 (SEDS?).				
<u>Commentary</u>					
<u>Implemented:</u>	N30	<u>Date resolved:</u>	10/11/95		

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

Issue number:	108	Raised by:	Dave Sanford	Date:	27-Jun-95
Document N:	13	Clause(s):	3	Status:	closed
<hr/>					
Issue title:	Definition of token separator			Class'n:	editorial
Description					
Definition of token separator: remove – the byte count is superfluous (not part of token); the text is common English.					
Proposed resolution:					
Actual resolution:					
Definition deleted for N22.					
Commentary					
JPF: Issue may be passed to SEDS coordinator (editorial issue against Part 21) -- author of issue to advise.					
Implemented:	N22	Date resolved:	08/11/95		
<hr/>					
Issue number:	110	Raised by:	Dave Sanford	Date:	27-Jun-95
Document N:	13	Clause(s):	4.1	Status:	open
<hr/>					
Issue title:	Long term utility of data			Class'n:	minor technical
Description					
Clause 4.1, first bullet point: needs the concept of “long term utility” of data					
Proposed resolution:					
Actual resolution:					
Commentary					
JPF: resolution to this issue should be reflected somewhere in clause 5 (N40). Left open for review by Qualification.					
Implemented:		Date resolved:			
<hr/>					
Issue number:	111	Raised by:	Dave Sanford	Date:	27-Jun-95
Document N:	13	Clause(s):	4.1	Status:	obsolete
<hr/>					
Issue title:	Dependency of data on processes			Class'n:	minor technical
Description					
Clause 4.1, third bullet point: note that data is not necessarily independent of the processes which create or consume it					
Proposed resolution:					
Actual resolution:					
Text referred to no longer appears in the document					
Commentary					
Implemented:	N30	Date resolved:	10/11/95		

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	112	<u>Raised by:</u>	Dave Sanford	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	4.1	<u>Status:</u>	open

<u>Issue title:</u>	Publicly available binding	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
<u>Description</u> Clause 4.1, end of last sentence: used to read “publicly available binding” which implied simultaneously computable and accessible. Need to preserve this thought.			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>			
<u>Commentary</u> JPF: resolution to this issue should be reflected somewhere in clause 5 (N40). Action assigned to author of this issue to propose text.			
<u>Implemented:</u>	<u>Date resolved:</u>		

<u>Issue number:</u>	113	<u>Raised by:</u>	Dave Sanford	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	4.2	<u>Status:</u>	open

<u>Issue title:</u>	Fundamental principles	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
<u>Description</u> Clause 4.2: add a sixth fundamental principle – “Ensure standard computable bindings exist”			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>			
<u>Commentary</u> JPF: resolution to this issue should be reflected somewhere in clause 5 (N40). See comment on issue #112.			
<u>Implemented:</u>	<u>Date resolved:</u>		

<u>Issue number:</u>	114	<u>Raised by:</u>	Dave Sanford	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	4.3	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Dependency of architecture elements	<u>Class'n:</u>	editorial
<u>Description</u> Clause 4.3, second paragraph after figure 1: add “... all elements of the architecture are dependent is ...”			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u> Issue is obsolete - relevant text has been removed.			
<u>Commentary</u> JPF: Text changed as proposed in N22, removed in N30.			
<u>Implemented:</u>	N22, N	<u>Date resolved:</u>	10/11/95

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

Issue number:	115	Raised by:	Dave Sanford	Date:	27-Jun-95
Document N:	13	Clause(s):	4.3	Status:	closed
<hr/>					
Issue title:	Link to purpose and application domain.				Class'n: editorial
Description					
Clause 4.3, second paragraph after figure 1, last sentence: change “such a representation ...” (to end of para.) to “to a specific purpose in a specific industrial application domain”.					
Proposed resolution:					
Actual resolution:					
Issue is obsolete - relevant text has been removed.					
Commentary					
JPF: Text changed as proposed in N22, removed in N30.					
Implemented:	N22, N	Date resolved:	10/11/95		
<hr/>					
Issue number:	116	Raised by:	Dave Sanford	Date:	27-Jun-95
Document N:	13	Clause(s):	4.3	Status:	closed
<hr/>					
Issue title:	Consistency of data specifications				Class'n: minor technical
Description					
Third paragraph after figure 1: omits AICs and the idea of binding resource constructs to their use.					
Proposed resolution:					
Actual resolution:					
Issue is obsolete - relevant text has been removed.					
Commentary					
Implemented:	N30	Date resolved:	10/11/95		
<hr/>					
Issue number:	117	Raised by:	Dave Sanford	Date:	27-Jun-95
Document N:	13	Clause(s):	4.3	Status:	accepted
<hr/>					
Issue title:	Data in figure 2 is an example.				Class'n: editorial
Description					
Figure 2: ensure that the part of the diagram labelled “DATA” is shown to be an example					
Proposed resolution:					
Actual resolution:					
Change to the diagram is accepted as proposed, but not yet implemented (figure D.1 in N40).					
Commentary					
Still not fixed in N62 (JPF).					
Implemented:		Date resolved:			

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	118	<u>Raised by:</u>	Dave Sanford	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	4.3	<u>Status:</u>	open
<u>Issue title:</u>	Referential integrity				<u>Class'n:</u> minor technical
<u>Description</u>	Clause 4.3, note at the bottom of page 11: isn't this the same as saying that STEP demonstrates the well accepted concept of referential integrity?				
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>					
<u>Actual resolution:</u>					
<u>Commentary</u>	JPF: text referenced is now in Annex D (N40).				
<u>Implemented:</u>	<u>Date resolved:</u>				
<u>Issue number:</u>	119	<u>Raised by:</u>	Dave Sanford	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	4.4	<u>Status:</u>	closed
<u>Issue title:</u>	"Us and them" syndrome				<u>Class'n:</u> editorial
<u>Description</u>	Clause 4.4: implies only "others" have vision; suggests others have data modelling expertise and overall integration responsibility				
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>					
<u>Actual resolution:</u>	Issue is obsolete - relevant text has been removed.				
<u>Commentary</u>					
<u>Implemented:</u>	N30	<u>Date resolved:</u>	10/11/95		
<u>Issue number:</u>	120	<u>Raised by:</u>	Dave Sanford	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	4.4	<u>Status:</u>	closed
<u>Issue title:</u>	Include matrix of joint responsibilities				<u>Class'n:</u> editorial
<u>Description</u>	Clause 4.4: include a matrix of joint responsibilities (not WG based)				
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>					
<u>Actual resolution:</u>	This issue is addressed within other SC4 "Methods" documents				
<u>Commentary</u>	JPF: where does this issue fall with respect to methods (in scope) vs. procedures & practices (out of scope).				
<u>Implemented:</u>	<u>Date resolved:</u>				03/19/96

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	121	<u>Raised by:</u>	Dave Sanford	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	5	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Change clause title	<u>Class'n:</u>	editorial
<u>Description</u>			
Clause 5: Change to "Design Principles of the ..."			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>			
Relevant clause is now "Fundamental concepts and assumptions"			
<u>Commentary</u>			
Clause (4) title changed as proposed in N22. Changed to "Fundamental concepts and assumptions" in N30.			
<u>Implemented:</u>	N22, N	<u>Date resolved:</u>	10/11/95

<u>Issue number:</u>	123	<u>Raised by:</u>	WG10/P1, Arlington	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	4	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Move Executive Summary	<u>Class'n:</u>	editorial
<u>Description</u>			
Move the Executive Summary to the Introduction, under a separate sub-clause heading.			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>			
Text of Executive Summary moved, as proposed (N22).			
<u>Commentary</u>			
JPF: concept of an Executive Summary no longer exists in the document (N30).			
<u>Implemented:</u>	N22	<u>Date resolved:</u>	08/11/95

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	124	<u>Raised by:</u>	WG10/P1, Arlington	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	6	<u>Status:</u>	deferred

<u>Issue title:</u>	Role of implementation forms	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
<u>Description</u> Add to clause 6: role of implementation forms (source: AP203 implementation schema discussions – requirements on all implementations; results of ad hoc committee, Atlanta?)			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u> A fuller discussion of implementation architectures is deferred.			
<u>Commentary</u> JPF: relevant section in N40 is clause 18.			
<u>Implemented:</u>		<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/19/96

<u>Issue number:</u>	125	<u>Raised by:</u>	Dave Sanford	<u>Date:</u>	27-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	5	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Restructure clause 5	<u>Class'n:</u>	editorial
<u>Description</u> Clause 5: restructure around the following design principles: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• human interpretable• computer interpretable• syntactic integration (single style)• structural integration (single structure for sharing of data)• semantic integration• context-dependent semantics• stability• extensibility• usability• Producibility• interoperability			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u> Include these statements of requirements in the appropriate subclauses within clause 5 (N40).			
<u>Actual resolution:</u> The structure of clause 5, although not fully based on the proposed resolution, is intended to meet the requirements of this issue.			
<u>Commentary</u> JPF: clause 5 has been heavily restructured, but not as proposed. Given that there are outstanding issues against clause 5 in N30 & N40, this issue should remain open. JPF: final resolution to the basis of an issue against Part 1.			
<u>Implemented:</u>	N62	<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/01/96

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	126	<u>Raised by:</u>	Debbie Washington	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jul-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	D.1	<u>Status:</u>	closed

Issue title: What is the difference between an AIC and an IR? **Class'n:** editorial

Description

Proposed FAQ: The concept of AICs and IRs seems to be the same. Where exactly do they differ, and as a developer how do I know which to use or research for possible overlaps of information?

Proposed resolution:

Actual resolution:

The differences between IRs and AICs are adequately addressed by the document.

Commentary

JPF: the previously proposed FAQs section has been removed (N30). Does the text of the latest version nonetheless answer this question?

JPF: should WG10 (/P1) create a STEP Architecture & Methods FAQ to be put onto SOLIS?

Implemented: **Date resolved:**

<u>Issue number:</u>	127	<u>Raised by:</u>	Debbie Washington	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jul-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	General	<u>Status:</u>	rejected

Issue title: Changes to document guidelines **Class'n:** editorial

Description

Why do they keep changing the document guidelines? They are making it harder and harder with all the new rules and constraints. (I commented that at least there is some boilerplate areas now, which were not in place three years ago).

Proposed resolution:

Actual resolution:

Commentary

JPF: Documentation guidelines are out of scope of Part 13. This issue should be raised with the AP Guidelines project (WG4/P5).

Implemented: **Date resolved:** 09/01/95

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	128	<u>Raised by:</u>	Debbie Washington	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jul-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	6.1	<u>Status:</u>	rejected

Issue title: Long-term use of the AAM **Class'n:** minor technical

Description

Once the ARM and AIM are complete, no one looks at the AAM. Why can't that section be dropped from the final version?

Proposed resolution:

Actual resolution:

Not true that "no one looks at the AAM": it is a key basis for understanding the scope statement and the applicability of the AP within industrial processes.

Commentary

Implemented: **Date resolved:** 03/19/96

<u>Issue number:</u>	129	<u>Raised by:</u>	Debbie Washington	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jul-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	6.3	<u>Status:</u>	closed

Issue title: Development of "short form" and "long form". **Class'n:** minor technical

Description

How are the EXPRESS long and short forms developed, and why is it necessary to include both in the AP?

Proposed resolution:

Actual resolution:

This issue is addressed by the AP Guidelines document

Commentary

Implemented: **Date resolved:** 03/19/96

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

Issue number:	131	Raised by:	Christof Rehling	Date:	01-Jul-95
Document N:	13	Clause(s):	general	Status:	closed

Issue title:	Level of detail vs. repetition of content	Class'n:	editorial
---------------------	---	-----------------	-----------

Description

As the document is intended to be a REFERENCE Manual, I would not mind if several issues are addressed in more than one place. In principle, I agree with your statement in the 3rd box on page 12, but if, e.g., aspects of AP Harmonisation were discussed in a section by themselves and mentioned where the structure of APs, in particular the ARM, is explained, I think that would be helpful. Cross-references should be given, though.

The thing is that many people looking something up in Part 13 may not be aware of how things interrelate. Thus, they will not automatically also check for AP Harmonisation if they think they need to look for AP development. Therefore, the larger set of knowledge has to be made available to them in a structured manner, and they need to be guided to adjacent subject areas. This is only possible if some issues are discussed in more than one place, and if proper cross-references exist.

Proposed resolution:

Actual resolution:

The restructuring implemented in N40 and N62 address this issue

Commentary

JPF: the use of cross-references between sections should be increased.

Implemented:	N40, N	Date resolved:	03/19/96
---------------------	--------	-----------------------	----------

Issue number:	132	Raised by:	C. Rehling	Date:	01-Jul-95
Document N:	13	Clause(s):	1	Status:	closed

Issue title:	Scope of Part 13	Class'n:	major technical
---------------------	------------------	-----------------	-----------------

Description

Scope of Part 13 (first two bullets in "1. Scope", page 1). The first and second bullet seem to contradict each other: either all standards within SC4, which covers 10303 and 13584 (and MANDATE?), or only 10303.

I think Part 13 would be of more use if it applied to all standards within SC4. Thus, ISO 13584 needs to be included and mentioned already in the introduction (page vi). If the methods of 13584 are not the same as those of 10303, the document may need to be split in 3 or 4 parts: The two that there are already, plus 1 for the architecture and 1 for the methodology of ISO 13584.

Given that a number of AP Project teams see the need for libraries in their models (which hopefully will lead to a defined way of using 13584 within 10303), it would be rather confusing if two separate Reference Manuals were to be developed.

Proposed resolution:

Actual resolution:

Scope is now limited to architecture and methodology of ISO 10303.

Commentary

Implemented:	N30	Date resolved:	10/11/95
---------------------	-----	-----------------------	----------

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	133	<u>Raised by:</u>	C. Rehling	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jul-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	3	<u>Status:</u>	transferred

<u>Issue title:</u>	Definition of "representation"	<u>Class'n:</u>	editorial
----------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------	-----------

Description

Definition of "representation" ("3. Definitions", pp.2 - 7)

The term "representation" is not defined. I think it should be defined or at least explained. In particular for people who are not native English speakers, a definition (or at least an explanation) would be helpful to develop the same concept (because the term translates into a number of words in our mother tongues, and we do not necessarily know which is closest to the intended usage of "representation").

Proposed resolution:

Actual resolution:

Issue against definition in Part 43.

Commentary

<u>Implemented:</u>	<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/19/96
----------------------------	------------------------------	----------

<u>Issue number:</u>	135	<u>Raised by:</u>	C. Rehling	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jul-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	4.1	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Diagram conventions	<u>Class'n:</u>	editorial
----------------------------	---------------------	------------------------	-----------

Description

Editorial - Fig. 1 (p. 10): Explanation of dashed line arrow is not given. I also would like to suggest to frame the figures, and to clearly separate any explanations from the rest of the text.

Proposed resolution:

Actual resolution:

The conventions used in figure 4 are stated in clause 6.

Commentary

JPF: a key should be given for all diagrams, if appropriate.

<u>Implemented:</u>	N62	<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/01/96
----------------------------	-----	------------------------------	----------

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

Issue number:	137	Raised by:	C. Rehling	Date:	01-Jul-95
Document N:	13	Clause(s):	general	Status:	closed

Issue title:	Structure of the document, clause numbering	Class'n:	editorial
---------------------	---	-----------------	-----------

Description

Editorial - Is it possible to clearly indicate the section of the document (Architecture or Methodology) by changing the numbering? That may help in using the document when individual sections or clauses are quoted. Currently, one would have to know that "9" indicated the first chapter of section II.

Would numbers I.1 through I.8 for the Architecture and II.1 through II.3 for the Methodology be allowed under ISO style requirements?

Proposed resolution:

Actual resolution:

Document is now divided into Sections, as permitted by ISO/IEC Directives.

Commentary

Implemented:	N22	Date resolved:	08/11/95
---------------------	-----	-----------------------	----------

Issue number:	138	Raised by:	C. Rehling	Date:	01-Jul-95
Document N:	13	Clause(s):	5.2	Status:	closed

Issue title:	AP integration and interoperability.	Class'n:	editorial
---------------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------	-----------

Description

Section 5.2, page 14; 4th paragraph, last sentence:

"Because Application Protocols are based on a single integrated model, applications that can read the data produced according to one Application Protocol are able to read data produced by any Application Protocol."

- I think the term "produced by an AP" is misleading. Suggestion: "Exchanged using an AP"
- I think the statement is not generally true, as APs may subtype IR constructs. In such a case, only the data contained in the "lowest common supertype" is understood by more than one AP. Depending on, e.g., the binding used in the exchange structure, some data are understood by both implementations (external binding) or no data are understood by both (internal binding).
- The last two lines on page 14 indicate that subtyping is allowed, contradicting (in my opinion) the sentence quoted above.

Proposed resolution:

Actual resolution:

Issue is obsolete - relevant text has been removed.

Commentary

JPF: see issue #81 for comments on the erroneous conclusion of the text referred to. However, the revised text (N22) still has "... produced by an AP ..." so that part of the issue is still relevant.

JPF: relevant text removed from N30.

Implemented:	N30	Date resolved:	10/11/95
---------------------	-----	-----------------------	----------

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	139	<u>Raised by:</u>	C. Rehling	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jul-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	5.3.7	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	APs and conformance classes	<u>Class'n:</u>	editorial
----------------------------	-----------------------------	------------------------	-----------

Description

Section 5.3.7, page 18; 1st para, 2nd sentence:
"Within each Application Protocol, the specification is further partitioned ..."
To my knowledge (and stated by Mary Mitchell in Greenville), APs are not required to have Conformance Classes.
Thus, I suggest to change the above statement to read " ..., the specification may be further partitioned ..."
(This fact is also given in the NOTE in section 6.7, page 20)

Proposed resolution:

Actual resolution:

Text changed as proposed.

Commentary

<u>Implemented:</u>	N22	<u>Date resolved:</u>	08/11/95
----------------------------	-----	------------------------------	----------

<u>Issue number:</u>	140	<u>Raised by:</u>	C. Rehling	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jul-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	7.3.4.1	<u>Status:</u>	open

<u>Issue title:</u>	Subsetting and conformance classes	<u>Class'n:</u>	editorial
----------------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------	-----------

Description

Section 7.3.4.1, page 25/26, third bullet:
"of the in-scope information, a subset OF INTEREST can be specified as the information requirements that must be met by the Application Protocol"
That effectively means that this OF INTEREST subset constitutes the lowest conformance classes of an AP, and it simultaneously indicates that there have to be at least two conformance classes (low = OF INTEREST, highest = all the AP) for this AP, doesn't it? If so, please state it, so that the concept of Conformance Classes is tied in to this AP development process.

Proposed resolution:

Actual resolution:

Commentary

<u>Implemented:</u>	<u>Date resolved:</u>
----------------------------	------------------------------

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	141	<u>Raised by:</u>	C.Rehling	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jul-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	5.3.6	<u>Status:</u>	deferred

<u>Issue title:</u>	Role of AICs and UOFs in the architecture.	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
----------------------------	--	------------------------	-----------------

Description

Section 5.3.6, page 18; 1st paragraph, 2nd and 3rd sentences

I think that the two levels on which relationships are said to exist between APs are not really two levels, i.e., not independent of each other.

If two particular APs that do not only by definition use the same set of IRs in addition also use the same subtypes of specific IR constructs, I think that does not add a new quality or dimension.

I would rather say that while all APs share a common foundation (IRs), some may also share a number of common "pillars". The AICs would be these "pillars". AICs are "more" than pure IR constructs. This "more" should be seen somewhere outside the AIM of those APs, i.e., if AICs are identified in the interpretation process, some ARM (and maybe AAM) level requirements must be resembling each other for those APs with common AICs.

What is the link between AICs and Units of Functionality or Functional Data Groups (AP 214 term)? Can UoFs or FDGs be the ARM-equivalents of AICs?

Proposed resolution:

Actual resolution:

Commentary

<u>Implemented:</u>	<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/19/96
----------------------------	------------------------------	----------

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

Issue number:	142	Raised by:	C. Rehling	Date:	01-Jul-95
Document N:	13	Clause(s):	7.3.5.3, 11.3.2,10.1.2	Status:	deferred
<hr/>					
Issue title:	AP harmonisation			Class'n:	minor technical
Description					
<p>Concerning the draft Part 13, I would like to suggest to address the (AP) Harmonisation issue not only in different places where parts of the contents of the AP are discussed. but also as a separate chapter, i.e., "orthogonal" to the AP thread.</p> <p>I think that some kind of harmonisation of the development of different APs is needed regardless of how it is performed. Thus I think the statement "There are pros and cons against Harmonisation activities." (section 7.3.5.3, page 28, 3rd paragraph) should be removed.</p> <p>I think that AP Harmonisation consists of several layers.</p> <p>Layer 1: Even before the AP is an active project in STEP, i.e., when the AP scope is drafted, other APs in the same domain or the same industry segment should be looked at. Possibly/Hopefully, a Core Model (like researched in AEC) can add value at this point.</p> <p>Layer 2: While the AP is being developed, i.e., AAM and ARM are created, the process called "AP Harmonisation/Harmonising (section 11.3.2)" in your Part 13 may be applied.</p> <p>Layer 3: In preparation of the AIM, AP interpretation takes over, and possible AICs are identified.</p> <p>I think one has to be careful not to "over-harmonise" in the middle layer, because there is a trade-off between efforts involved there and the later interpretation stage. However, I would expect efforts in the field of harmonisation of AP scopes (layer 1) to pay off much sooner and also to add value to STEP by ensuring that APs fit together. (For example, if a suite of APs is to be developed supporting the design activities in an industry segment, it should be ensured that all design activities are captured either by the Predesign or by the Design AP, such that no "holes" in the activities in design remain that are not covered by either AP.)</p> <p>Concerning the box on page 38 (section 10.1.2), I suggest that as long as there is no definitive feedback from different teams testing different approaches to ARM development, this part of the document be seen as a living document. Perhaps the entire issue of harmonisation could be made an annex as soon as the situation is not stable. Thus, it can be updated easier.</p>					
Proposed resolution:					
Actual resolution:					
Commentary					
Implemented:		Date resolved:	03/19/96		
<hr/>					
Issue number:	143	Raised by:	WG5/P1 (Sydney)	Date:	01-Mar-95
Document N:	138	Clause(s):	4?	Status:	closed
<hr/>					
Issue title:	Traceability of data to industry need			Class'n:	minor technical
Description					
<p>Is the traceability of data to industry need related to the Application Activity Model?, the Application Reference Model?, the Application Interpreted Model? or combinations of these?</p>					
Proposed resolution:					
Actual resolution:					
<p>Traceability of industry need relates to all elements of the AP, as is shown by the dependencies in figure 4.</p>					
Commentary					
Implemented:	N62	Date resolved:	03/01/96		

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

Issue number:	144	Raised by:	WG5/P1 (Sydney)	Date:	01-Mar-95
Document N:	138	Clause(s):	??	Status:	deferred
<hr/>					
Issue title:	Over-constraint of AP scope and context				Class'n: minor technical
Description					
Does the specification of industry need for data (instance) over-constrain the usage of an Application Protocol, either in its applicability to scopes other than that for which it is designed (e.g., applying AP203 to maintenance data), or by preventing further constraints on the context?					
Proposed resolution:					
Actual resolution:					
Commentary					
Implemented:		Date resolved:	03/19/96		
<hr/>					
Issue number:	145	Raised by:	WG5/P1 (Sydney)	Date:	01-Mar-95
Document N:	138	Clause(s):	4?	Status:	open
<hr/>					
Issue title:	Traceability of data to industry need.				Class'n: minor technical
Description					
The principle of traceability of data to industry need is vague, and may in fact be derived from the principle of standardisation of industry application semantics. Is the requirement for traceability of data to industry needs, or for mappability of industry needs to data?					
Proposed resolution:					
Actual resolution:					
Commentary					
Implemented:		Date resolved:			
<hr/>					
Issue number:	146	Raised by:	WG5/P1 (Sydney)	Date:	01-Mar-95
Document N:	139	Clause(s):	4	Status:	deferred
<hr/>					
Issue title:	Representation of "non-product" geometry				Class'n: major technical
Description					
Does the structure of the ISO 10303 Integrated Resources prevent the representation of “non-product” geometry, such as the shape of the environment in which a building is to be constructed?					
Proposed resolution:					
Actual resolution:					
Commentary					
JPF: this may be a candidate FAQ.					
Implemented:		Date resolved:	03/19/96		

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	147	<u>Raised by:</u>	WG5/P1 (Sydney)	<u>Date:</u>	01-Mar-95
<u>Document N:</u>	138	<u>Clause(s):</u>	4?	<u>Status:</u>	deferred

<u>Issue title:</u>	Emphasis on product data	<u>Class'n:</u>	major technical
----------------------------	--------------------------	------------------------	-----------------

Description

Does the emphasis on product data in the terminology of ISO 10303, and the naming of the product entity, cause confusion with respect to understanding the scope of applicability of ISO 10303?

Proposed resolution:

Actual resolution:

Commentary

<u>Implemented:</u>	<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/19/96
----------------------------	------------------------------	----------

<u>Issue number:</u>	148	<u>Raised by:</u>	WG5/P1 (Sydney)	<u>Date:</u>	01-Mar-95
<u>Document N:</u>	138	<u>Clause(s):</u>	4?	<u>Status:</u>	deferred

<u>Issue title:</u>	Level of abstraction of ARM and AIM	<u>Class'n:</u>	major technical
----------------------------	-------------------------------------	------------------------	-----------------

Description

Are Application Reference Models and Application Interpreted Models at the same level of abstraction? If they are, are both needed in an Application Protocol, or is the Application Reference Model a development tool that should not be included in the final documentation of the Application Protocol as a standard?

Proposed resolution:

Actual resolution:

Commentary

<u>Implemented:</u>	<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/19/96
----------------------------	------------------------------	----------

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

Issue number: 149 **Raised by:** Thomas Thurman **Date:** 01-Mar-95

Document N: 138 **Clause(s):** ?? **Status:** deferred

Issue title: Flaw in interpretation methodology **Class'n:** minor technical

Description

The interpretation methodology is flawed in that there are multiple levels of information discovery that occur during the development of an Application Reference Model, but the current methodology documentation ignores that fact. For instance, once an Integrated Resource is available that is almost purely representation (e.g., geometry), an Application Protocol project should be able to identify that with a simple reference to the kinds (Application Interpreted Constructs) of geometry needed. An elaborate model in the Application Reference Model of detailed information requirements is redundant and most likely will contain errors of fact that will:

- need to be corrected;
- mislead the Interpretation project.

Proposed resolution:

Actual resolution:

Commentary

Implemented: **Date resolved:** 03/19/96

Issue number: 150 **Raised by:** Bernd Wenzel **Date:** 01-Mar-95

Document N: 138 **Clause(s):** 1, 6.6 **Status:** deferred

Issue title: Use of the EXPRESS language **Class'n:** minor technical

Description

The STEP methodology has ignored and/or not accepted the correct use of the EXPRESS language, with particular respect to the use of the ABSTRACT SUPERTYPE construct, and the USE and REFERENCE interface statements.

Proposed resolution:

Actual resolution:

Commentary

JPF: this issue has been "rescued" from a footnote in the post-Sydney version of Part 13 (WG5 N139).

Implemented: **Date resolved:** 03/19/96

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	151	<u>Raised by:</u>	Felix Metzger	<u>Date:</u>	01-Mar-95
<u>Document N:</u>	139	<u>Clause(s):</u>	5.2	<u>Status:</u>	transferred
<u>Issue title:</u>	Use of EXPRESS EXISTS function.				<u>Class'n:</u> minor technical
<u>Description</u>	Why is the EXPRESS EXISTS function not used in reference path constraints?				
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>					
<u>Actual resolution:</u>	Issue is transferred to the WG4 AIM Development project (or its successor in the Quality Committee)				
<u>Commentary</u>	JPF: this issue has been "rescued" from a footnote in the post-Sydney version of Part 13 (WG5 N139).				
<u>Implemented:</u>	<u>Date resolved:</u>				
<u>Issue number:</u>	152	<u>Raised by:</u>	WG5/P1 (Sydney)	<u>Date:</u>	01-Mar-97
<u>Document N:</u>	139	<u>Clause(s):</u>	5.2	<u>Status:</u>	closed
<u>Issue title:</u>	Use of management resource templates				<u>Class'n:</u> minor technical
<u>Description</u>	Page 15, "Principles of application protocols": add a bullet describing the use of the management resource template entities				
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>					
<u>Actual resolution:</u>	The use of these templates is already described in Part 41.				
<u>Commentary</u>	JPF: this issue has been "rescued" from a footnote in the post-Sydney version of Part 13 (WG5 N139).				
<u>Implemented:</u>	<u>Date resolved:</u> 03/19/96				
<u>Issue number:</u>	153	<u>Raised by:</u>	Julian Fowler	<u>Date:</u>	06-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	Introduction	<u>Status:</u>	deferred
<u>Issue title:</u>	Data exchange vs. data management				<u>Class'n:</u> major technical
<u>Description</u>	First paragraph of introduction: is this sufficient in terms of the short and long term goals of ISO 10303 and its potential customers in industry? Does this statement exclude the fulfilment of requirements for data management as distinct from data exchange?				
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>					
<u>Actual resolution:</u>					
<u>Commentary</u>					
<u>Implemented:</u>	<u>Date resolved:</u> 03/19/96				

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

Issue number:	154	Raised by:	Julian Fowler	Date:	06-Jun-95
Document N:	13	Clause(s):	Scope	Status:	closed

Issue title:	Applicability to other SC4 standards	Class'n:	major technical
---------------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------	-----------------

Description

By SC4 resolution 75, it is required that P-LIB makes use of this methodology, unless WG2 is able to prove that the methodology cannot be used. Review of initial ISO 13584 documents suggest that the methodology used or assumed in their development differs from that described in this Reference Manual. The development of this document should address this issue, resulting either in the alignment of ISO 13584 development with that of ISO 10303, or by stimulating the development of a corresponding Reference Manual describing the Architecture and Methodology of ISO 13584. In the latter case, ISO TC184/SC4/WG10 will be required to develop and document the higher level "meta-architecture and meta-methodology" that allows the 10303 and 13584 work to be related.

Proposed resolution:

Actual resolution:

Revised scope statement refers to ISO 10303 only.

Commentary

JPF: the document now states that its scope of applicability is that of the architecture and development methodology of ISO 10303 -- is this too limiting? If the audience is STEP only, why is being standardised?

Implemented:	N62	Date resolved:	03/01/96
---------------------	-----	-----------------------	----------

Issue number:	155	Raised by:	Julian Fowler	Date:	05-Jun-95
Document N:	13	Clause(s):	5.1	Status:	closed

Issue title:	Limitation on scope of ISO 10303?	Class'n:	minor technical
---------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------	-----------------

Description

5.1, first paragraph: is this statement intended to be a limiting statement of scope with respect to the applicability of STEP? What about operations, procurement, logistics, etc.

Proposed resolution:

Actual resolution:

Issue is obsolete - relevant text has been removed.

Commentary

Implemented:	N30	Date resolved:	10/11/95
---------------------	-----	-----------------------	----------

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	156	<u>Raised by:</u>	Sheila Lewis	<u>Date:</u>	06-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	5.2	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Centralised integration/interpretation resources	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
<u>Description</u>			
Is the use of “a single, centralised group of people in integration and interpretation” the best way of fulfilling industry’s needs?			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>			
Issue is obsolete - relevant text has been removed.			
<u>Commentary</u>			
<u>Implemented:</u>	N30	<u>Date resolved:</u>	10/11/95

<u>Issue number:</u>	158	<u>Raised by:</u>	Julian Fowler	<u>Date:</u>	01-Mar-95
<u>Document N:</u>	138	<u>Clause(s):</u>	?? (10.1.2 in N13)	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Improvement to ARM development methods	<u>Class'n:</u>	major technical
<u>Description</u>			
The development of an ARM, and the specification of information requirements, is one of the weaker elements of the ISO 10303 methodology, in that the guidance provided to Application Protocol development teams is little more than that presented here. Significant advances are, however, being made in this area, particularly within projects that are addressing a broad spectrum of requirements within an industry sector. Improved techniques for ARM development are being employed in Application Protocol projects in the automotive, process plant, shipbuilding, and building & construction sectors; harmonisation and acceptance of these techniques is likely to lead to their incorporation into the “core” methodology of ISO 10303.			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>			
Issue is obsolete - relevant text has been removed.			
<u>Commentary</u>			
<u>Implemented:</u>	N30	<u>Date resolved:</u>	10/11/95

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	159	<u>Raised by:</u>	Stuart Lord	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jun-95
<u>Document N:</u>	13	<u>Clause(s):</u>	10.5	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	ARM development methods	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
----------------------------	-------------------------	------------------------	-----------------

Description

Section not particularly helpful. Does reasonable job of stating what has to be done, but doesn't give much guidance on how to do it or how to recognize when the job is done, not to mention the issue of whether the people are competent to do it.

Proposed resolution:

Actual resolution:

Issue is obsolete - relevant text has been removed.

Commentary

JPF: does the same issue apply to 14.3 (N40)?

<u>Implemented:</u>	N30	<u>Date resolved:</u>	10/11/95
----------------------------	-----	------------------------------	----------

<u>Issue number:</u>	160	<u>Raised by:</u>	Julian Fowler	<u>Date:</u>	01-Dec-95
<u>Document N:</u>	30	<u>Clause(s):</u>	Part title	<u>Status:</u>	open

<u>Issue title:</u>	Part title is incorrect	<u>Class'n:</u>	editorial
----------------------------	-------------------------	------------------------	-----------

Description

The part title as it appears on the cover sheet and immediately before clause 1 is incorrect. The title given below was agreed by WG5/P1, and has not been changed.

Proposed resolution:

Replace the existing part title by "Description methods: Architecture and methodology reference manual". Check with SC4 Secretariat to ensure that the correct part title appears in SC4 list of projects

Actual resolution:

Commentary

Title in N40 is given as "Description methods: architecture and *development* methods reference manual" on the cover sheet, but as "Description methods: STEP architecture and development methodology in the part title preceding clause 1! WG10/P1 must resolve the issue of the actual title. Still the case in N62.

<u>Implemented:</u>	<u>Date resolved:</u>
----------------------------	------------------------------

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

Issue number:	161	Raised by:	Julian Fowler	Date:	30-Nov-95
Document N:	30	Clause(s):	1	Status:	open

Issue title:	Scope is not well defined	Class'n:	minor technical
---------------------	---------------------------	-----------------	-----------------

Description

The scope of the document is not well defined, and is worded inconsistently. There is no mention of architecture as an in-scope item.

Proposed resolution:

Reword the first part of the scope statement as follows:

This part of ISO 10303 describes the architecture and development methodology of ISO 10303. It also includes the fundamental concepts and assumptions on which the architecture and methodology are based.

The following are within the scope of this part of ISO 10303:

- the architecture of ISO 10303;
- the methods used to develop ISO 10303 application protocols, including:
 - a) the methods used to discover and capture industry application requirements for product data
 - b) the methods used to satisfy industry application requirements for product data
 - c) the methods used to determine the structure and content of conformance classes

NOTE 1 - the methods used to satisfy industry application requirements for product data are referred to as "application interpretation"

- the methods used to develop ISO 10303 integrated resources

NOTE 2 - the methods used to develop ISO 10303 integrated resources are referred to as "resource integration".

Actual resolution:

Commentary

JPF: Scope statement in N40 is improved; it is still too STEP-focused (self referential).

<u>Implemented:</u>	<u>Date resolved:</u>
----------------------------	------------------------------

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

Issue number:	162	Raised by:	Julian Fowler	Date:	30-Nov-95
Document N:	30	Clause(s):	1	Status:	open

Issue title: Scope statement is incomplete **Class'n:** minor technical

Description

The scope statement should reflect that the fact that Part 13 includes the principles and methods of the ISO 10303 architecture and methodology, but does *not* include the procedures and practices by which ISO 10303 is developed within SC4.

Proposed resolution:

Add the following bullet and note at the end of scope clause:

- the procedures and practices by which the ISO 10303 architecture and methodology are applied to specific standards development activities.

NOTE 3 - documentation of the procedures and practices used within ISO TC184/SC4 is identified in Annex ??? (the bibliography)

Actual resolution:

Commentary

AMcK: Added bullet. (Procedures and practices) are referred to throughout. Refs clause includes docs other than proc & prac -> note 3 is a bad idea.

JPF: Bullet *not* added to scope clause in N40

Implemented: **Date resolved:**

Issue number:	163	Raised by:	Julian Fowler	Date:	30-Nov-95
Document N:	30	Clause(s):	5.1.1	Status:	closed

Issue title: Industry requirements and ISO 10303 **Class'n:** editorial

Description

Clause 5.1.1 states that there are industry requirements for ISO 10303. This is misleading: in fact, there are industry requirements for the exchange, sharing, archiving, and integration of product data. ISO 10303 is standard that enables implementation of software solutions to these requirements.

Proposed resolution:

Replace the opening sentence of 5.1.1 by the following:

The industrial requirements that ISO 10303 is designed to [or maybe "intended to"] fulfill are:

Actual resolution:

Addressed by restructuring of clause 5 in N62.

Commentary

AMcK: obsolete issue.

JPF: The changes from N30 -> N40 if anything make this a more serious issue! There is now *no* clear identification of the requirements that ISO 10303 addresses. I propose that this is discussed at Dallas.

Implemented: N62 **Date resolved:** 03/01/96

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

Issue number: 164 **Raised by:** Julian Fowler **Date:** 30-Nov-95

Document N: 30 **Clause(s):** 5.1.1 **Status:** deferred

Issue title: Exchange scenarios **Class'n:** major technical

Description

Characterization of the exchange requirements on ISO 10303 as "... complete exchange of data between similar applications" is incomplete and misleading. This does not capture the real requirements that ISO 10303 should be addressing, which should be described in terms of abstracted usage scenarios. The text needs to address the fact that ISO 10303 has to support exchange of data based on the semantics of the data, not on the use made of the data within systems. Also, mention needs to be made of the support for intra- and inter-enterprise exchange (even though this may not be adequately recognized by STEP today).

An alternative approach, that would need resolution to issue #166 as well as further discussion, would be to state that the requirement that STEP seeks to fulfil is "interoperability between computer applications used in all phases of the product life cycle".

Proposed resolution:

Replace the first bullet of 5.1.1 by the following:

- exchange of data between applications that share common product information;

[This needs wordsmithing -- I'm trying to say 'application context' without using those words! maybe 'application context' *should* be used, given that its a defined term in clause 3, with a forward reference to a later clause that explains this concept further].

- exchange of data between applications with common functionality;

EXAMPLE x - exchange of shape information between 3D modelling systems.

- exchange of data between applications with different functionality;

EXAMPLE y - exchange of information describing an electrical network from a schematic design system to a simulation system.

- exchange of data between disciplines within an enterprise;

- exchange of data between enterprises.

Actual resolution:

Commentary

AMcK: This is too garbled to address - terms need definition before it can be addressed.

JPF: Discuss at Dallas.

Implemented: **Date resolved:** 03/19/96

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

Issue number:	165	Raised by:	Julian Fowler	Date:	30-Nov-95
Document N:	30	Clause(s):	5.1.1	Status:	open

Issue title:	Goal of ISO 10303	Class'n:	minor technical
---------------------	-------------------	-----------------	-----------------

Description

The goal is ISO 10303 as stated in 5.1.1 applies only to those industries and application areas that *have* previous standards. In any case, such a "relative" goal is difficult to assess, and also implies that STEP is characterized as "a better IGES", "a better SET", etc. As Yuhwei Yang argues in her paper 'STEP application protocol implementation' (as abstracted in Annex L of N30), STEP is *fundamentally* different from IGES, so comparison between the two is dangerous.

Proposed resolution:

EITHER:

Delete text from "The goal of ISO 10303 ..." to "... not included in previous standards".

OR:

Replace this text by the following:

The goal of ISO 10303 is to fulfill these requirements through the development of specifications that are judged by industry to be both effective and efficient in development, implementation, and use.

***** include the Yang/Burkett statements about efficiency vs. effectiveness *****

Actual resolution:

Commentary

AMcK: Obsolete. 5.1.2 (N40) does not mention IGES.

JPF: The reference to "existing standards" is still there - 5.1.2 (d). I still question the relevance of unqualified comparison with STEP.

Implemented:	Date resolved:
---------------------	-----------------------

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

Issue number:	166	Raised by:	Julian Fowler	Date:	30-Nov-95
Document N:	30	Clause(s):	5.1.1	Status:	closed

Issue title:	Definition of 'interoperability'	Class'n:	editorial
---------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------	-----------

Description

Clause 5.1.1 refers to interoperability 'in the ISO sense'. Whilst it is important to establish a useful definition of interoperability that corresponds to its usage here (and to deprecate the term in the phrase 'AP Interoperability').

Proposed resolution:

EITHER

Reference an appropriate definition an another ISO standard.

OR

Provide an adequate definition in Clause 3, with a recommendation that this should be migrated into Part 1.

Actual resolution:

Commentary

Reference removed from N40.

Implemented:	N40	Date resolved:	12/13/95
---------------------	-----	-----------------------	----------

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

Issue number: 167 **Raised by:** Julian Fowler **Date:** 30-Nov-95

Document N: 30 **Clause(s):** 5.1.1 **Status:** deferred

Issue title: preprocessors and postprocessors **Class'n:** minor technical

Description

5.1.1 (sixth paragraph) refers to interoperation between a preprocessor and a postprocessor. This is, I believe, not a valid characterization of the requirements that STEP seeks to fulfill. Rather, this is a *solution* to the requirement for interoperability of applications. It also appears to introduce a possible misconception of the nature of STEP and its implementation. (Diagram below works in monospaced fonts only!!)

[illegible]

The success of STEP must depend on the understanding that the requirement is for interoperability between *applications*, not between interfaces. Obviously, the scope of many STEP APs is such that not every semantic concept included is supported by all applications. However, successful exchange (particularly in the context of life-cycle data integration in management) depends on *retention* of the data that is exchanged. If this results from an interface splitting an instance of an AIM schema into two subsets:

- concepts supported by the application
- concepts not supported by the application

then STEP should require that data in the latter class is at least retained, with integrity checking, so that it can be included in data prepared for onward transmission. At this level we must consider the interface to be *part* of the application, not something peripheral to it.

Proposed resolution:

In the sixth paragraph of 5.1.1:

Replace third sentence by:

This requirement is that of interoperation between applications, achieved through exchange of data conforming to an agreed specification. This specification identifies the data that represents the shared semantics of the applications.

In the fourth sentence, replace 'processors' by 'interfaces', delete the word 'similar'.

In the fifth sentence, delete the parenthetic text.

Actual resolution:

Commentary

AMCK: We think these changes should be in next version. Proposed resolution obsolete - needs writing in terms of current document.

Implemented: **Date resolved:** 03/19/96

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

Issue number:	168	Raised by:	Julian Fowler	Date:	30-Nov-95
Document N:	30	Clause(s):	5.1.1	Status:	transferred

Issue title:	Limitation to product data exchange	Class'n:	major technical
---------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	-----------------

Description

The quotation from Part 1, and the following paragraph, have an unfortunate juxtaposition:

Part 1: "... suitable for ... file exchange ... implementing and sharing product databases ... and archiving."

Part 13: "The ISO 10303 architecture and development methodology are designed to support ... product data exchange."

The message therefore seems that there is a requirement for three things (exchange, sharing, archiving), of which STEP addresses only the first. If this is the case, then the Part 1 text needs to be changed *immediately*, with corrigenda issued for all the published parts, to remove the unsubstantiated claim for support of sharing and archiving.

However, I believe that the initial statement is flawed. The ISO 10303 architecture and methodology *are* designed to support all three requirements. The issue is one of degree, and the level to which it is currently feasible to standardise solutions.

Proposed resolution:

Delete the first sentence of the sixth paragraph of 5.1.1.

Reword the second sentence:

The ISO 10303 architecture and methodology are designed to fulfill this objective.

Actual resolution:

Transfer to Part 1 amendment project

Commentary

AMcK: refer to Part 1.

JPF: does this mean that STEP really does *only* address data exchange??

Implemented:	Date resolved:	03/19/96
---------------------	-----------------------	----------

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	169	<u>Raised by:</u>	Julian Fowler	<u>Date:</u>	30-Nov-95
<u>Document N:</u>	30	<u>Clause(s):</u>	5.1.1	<u>Status:</u>	open

<u>Issue title:</u>	Requirements for archiving and sharing.	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
----------------------------	---	------------------------	-----------------

Description

The industrial requirements for archiving and sharing of product data are not adequately described.

Proposed resolution:

Include appropriate text that describes the requirements for archiving and sharing. The minutes of the London WG5/P1 workshop (July 1994) include statements of requirements for sharing. Similar statements are available in document WG10 N31 (expressed as requirements for data communication and data integration: for the purposes of Part 13, it is better to retain the 'exchange' and 'sharing' terminology).
See also issue #173

Actual resolution:

Commentary

AMcK: Definition of sharing reflects agreement in Grenoble. July '94 not adequate.
JPF: N40 is an improvement over N30, but I believe that there are still some key aspects of data sharing that have been missed out. Make sure that input from Matthew West, Bernd Wenzel is captured.

Implemented:

Date resolved:

<u>Issue number:</u>	170	<u>Raised by:</u>	Julian Fowler	<u>Date:</u>	30-Nov-95
<u>Document N:</u>	30	<u>Clause(s):</u>	5.1.1	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Requirements vs. goals	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
----------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	-----------------

Description

Clause 5.1.1 provides two pieces of information:

- the industry requirements that ISO 10303 seeks to fulfill
- the goals that have been set (or assumed) for the development of ISO 10303

Proposed resolution:

Split 5.1.1 into two sub-clauses headed 'Industrial requirements' and 'Goal of ISO 10303'.

Actual resolution:

Issue is addressed by restructuring of clause 5 in N62

Commentary

AMcK: obsolete - rewrite against current document or resolve.
JPF: Structure of clause 5 is still flawed. I will recast the issue for Dallas.

Implemented:

Date resolved:

N62 03/01/96

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	171	<u>Raised by:</u>	Julian Fowler	<u>Date:</u>	30-Nov-95
<u>Document N:</u>	30	<u>Clause(s):</u>	5.1.2, 5.1.3	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Concepts vs. assumptions	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
----------------------------	--------------------------	------------------------	-----------------

Description

As discussed at the Grenoble meeting, it is very difficult to draw a dividing line between concepts and assumptions.

Proposed resolution:

Combine clauses 5.1.2 and 5.1.3 as a single sub-clause "Fundamental concepts and assumptions".

Actual resolution:

Issue is addressed by restructuring of clause 5 in N62

Commentary

AMcK: For consistency with other parts - see OED for definitions of "concept" and "assumptions". The distinction is clear - this could be done, though.

JPF: Other ISO 10303 parts I've looked have a single FC&As clause.

<u>Implemented:</u>	N62	<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/01/96
----------------------------	-----	------------------------------	----------

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

Issue number:	172	Raised by:	Julian Fowler	Date:	30-Nov-95
Document N:	30	Clause(s):	5.1.2	Status:	closed

Issue title:	Invalid or incomplete assumptions	Class'n:	minor technical
---------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------	-----------------

Description

5.1.2 (a) is not an assumption at the level of ISO 10303 itself (it may be valid at the level of *implementations* of ISO 10303). As noted in previous issues, the requirement addressed by STEP is that of interoperability between product data applications.

5.1.2 (b) states an assumption that ISO 10303 is concerned with the information content of groups of applications. This is a consequence rather than an assumption. The assumption should actually be that ISO 10303 is concerned with the information used by industrial enterprises to describe products.

5.1.3 (c) is potentially ambiguous -- ISO 10303 is not concerned with *standardizing* the internals of applications. However, assessment of conformance to the requirements of a STEP AP requires that the application does support the semantics that are in scope.

Proposed resolution:

Replace the fundamental assumptions by the following:

The following fundamental concepts and assumptions apply:

- a) ISO 10303 is concerned with the interoperability of product data applications
- b) ISO 10303 is concerned with the semantics of product data that is created and used by industrial enterprises
- c) ISO 10303 is concerned with the standardisation of data specification that capture product data semantics
- d) ISO 10303 is concerned with the standardisation of data specifications for groups of product data applications
- e) ISO 10303 is not concerned with the standardisation of the functions or data specifications of specific product data applications

Actual resolution:

Issue is addressed by restructuring of clause 5 in N62

Commentary

AMcK: Description of the issue is obsolete - needs rewriting against current doc. Proposed resolution (a): what does "interoperability" mean - see earlier issue. (b): what is an industrial enterprise (definition)? (c)-(e) these are worse than we have.

Implemented:	N62	Date resolved:	03/01/96
---------------------	-----	-----------------------	----------

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

Issue number:	173	Raised by:	Julian Fowler	Date:	30-Nov-95
Document N:	30	Clause(s):	5.1.3	Status:	closed

Issue title:	Fundamental concepts of ISO 10303	Class'n:	editorial
---------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------	-----------

Description

As discussed at the Grenoble meeting, the first three points under 5.1.3 are effectively descriptions of the *requirements* that ISO 10303 is designed to satisfy.

Proposed resolution:

If the text of Part 1 is useful, it can be quoted rather than referenced (cf. quotation from Part 1 in 5.1.1). Move these three sections of text to 5.1.1, in part satisfying the proposed resolution to issue #169 above.

The remaining text of 5.1.3 becomes the last item under the merged "Fundamental concepts and assumptions" clause, reworded as:

f) ISO 10303 is concerned with the representation of product data ...

Actual resolution:

Issue is addressed by restructuring of clause 5 in N62

Commentary

AMcK: Obsolete - text has changed.

Implemented:	N62	Date resolved:	03/01/96
---------------------	-----	-----------------------	----------

Issue number:	174	Raised by:	Julian Fowler	Date:	30-Nov-95
Document N:	30	Clause(s):	5.1.3	Status:	open

Issue title:	Missing concept/assumption	Class'n:	minor technical
---------------------	----------------------------	-----------------	-----------------

Description

The concept/assumption that it is appropriate to standardise "conceptual" product data models (in the sense of implementation independence) is missing.

Proposed resolution:

Add the following to the "Fundamental concepts and assumptions" clause:

g) ISO 10303 is concerned with the standardisation of data specifications that are independent of any specific implementation method.

Actual resolution:

Commentary

AMcK: This is self-justification - not allowed in a standard (see Editing Committee).

Implemented:		Date resolved:	
---------------------	--	-----------------------	--

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

Issue number: 175 **Raised by:** Julian Fowler **Date:** 30-Nov-95

Document N: 30 **Clause(s):** 5.2.1 **Status:** closed

Issue title: Requirements on the ISO 10303 architecture **Class'n:** minor technical

Description

Item (a) under 5.2.1 confuses the document structure with the architecture. A *decision* was made by SC4 that ISO 10303 should be documented as a series of parts, based on the underlying architecture. However, from a logical viewpoint there is no reason why ISO 10303 should not be a single, maintained document. The real requirement is that the total capabilities of ISO 10303 should be partitioned to support the different requirements of industry sectors and applications.

Item (b) is not a requirement -- it is a consequence of a requirement, i.e., the result of a design decision.

In addition, these are not really requirements as such: more fundamental concepts and assumptions

Proposed resolution:

Replace 5.2.1 by the following (as part of a single subclause 'ISO 10303 architecture'):

The following fundamental concepts and assumptions apply:

- a) the diverse nature of industry product data applications requires that ISO 10303 should be partitioned, such that elements of the standard that support specific industry needs may be readily identified and used
- b) industry needs for interoperability of product data applications and integration of product data, potentially across different application domains, requires that ISO 10303 has a consistent underlying architecture
- c) it is not feasible to develop a standard that supports all industry product data applications without an incremental approach
- d) it is not feasible to predict the precise nature of future product data applications
- e) as a consequence of (c) and (d), ISO 10303 is required to be extensible without invalidating existing portions

Actual resolution:

Commentary

Text in N40 has been updated.

Implemented: N40 **Date resolved:** 12/13/95

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

Issue number:	176	Raised by:	Julian Fowler	Date:	30-Nov-95
Document N:	30	Clause(s):	5.2.2	Status:	accepted

Issue title:	Upward and downward compatibility	Class'n:	minor technical
---------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------	-----------------

Description

I do not believe that this is a requirement, at least in the way that it is described here. Clearly, STEP must support compatibility in the sense that an implementation based on the nth release of a given AP should be able to process (read) data based on the mth release (where $m < n$). Even in this case, it may be necessary to apply some additional transformation to the data, or to add additional data, for the results to be fully meaningful in the context of the release n implementation.

I believe that it is a requirement on the developers of each revision of a STEP part to determine and to document what such compatibility means, and (if necessary) to standardise any transformation algorithms or procedures. Archiving is supported not up upward/downward compatibility of implementations, but by explicit reference to the specification to which the archive conforms. Access using implementations of later versions of the standard is predicated on the availability of transformation algorithms.

The reverse requirement (that a conforming implementation of AP203:1994) should be able to process data from any future release is clearly nonsense -- see comments above about the infeasibility of predicting future product data requirements.

Proposed resolution:

Replace 5.2.2 (a) with the following:

a) implementations that conform to an ISO 10303 specification (application protocol and/or implementation form) should be able to process data produced by an implementation conforming to a previous release of the same specification. This processing may require transformation of the data. If this is the case, then the later version of the specification is required to specify the transformations that are required.

Actual resolution:

Commentary

AMcK: leave as issue for discussion - I'm not sure of this wording.

<u>Implemented:</u>	<u>Date resolved:</u>
----------------------------	------------------------------

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

Issue number:	177	Raised by:	Julian Fowler	Date:	30-Nov-95
Document N:	30	Clause(s):	5.1.3	Status:	closed

Issue title:	Incorrect references to Part 1	Class'n:	editorial
---------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------	-----------

Description

5.1.3 makes reference to Part 1 for definitions/descriptions of "product data exchange", "product data sharing" and "product data archiving". These references are not resolved in Part 1.

Part 1 includes the following:

The 'standard' Introduction text "... basis for implementing and sharing product databases and archiving"

Definitions (clause 3) of 'data exchange' and 'product data', where 'data exchange' is defined as 'the storing, accessing, transferring, and archiving of data'.

4.1 'Purpose' standaeds that (ISO 10303) '... permits different implementation methods to be used for storing, accessing, transferring, and archiving product data.'

Even if the Part 1 definitions are satisfactory (which can be questioned), there is nothing said about product data sharing as such, and product data archiving is regarded as a type of product data exchange.

Proposed resolution:

1. Delete references to Part 1 from 5.1.3 (see also proposed resolutions to issue #173 above).
2. Raise issues against Part 1 -- the discussion in Part 13 implies that (product) data exchange, (product) data sharing, and (product) data archiving should be separately identified and defined terms.
3. Ensure that the terminology of Parts 1 and 13 is consistent.

Actual resolution:

Commentary

References removed for N40

Implemented:	N40	Date resolved:	12/13/95
---------------------	-----	-----------------------	----------

Issue number:	178	Raised by:	Alison McKay	Date:	13-Dec-95
Document N:	40	Clause(s):	7	Status:	open

Issue title:	Testing and application context	Class'n:	minor technical
---------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------	-----------------

Description

What does the last sentence of this clause, which includes the phrase "tests satisfaction", mean?

Proposed resolution:

Actual resolution:

Commentary

Implemented:	Date resolved:
---------------------	-----------------------

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

Issue number:	179	Raised by:	Alison McKay	Date:	13-Dec-95
Document N:	40	Clause(s):	9.6	Status:	deferred
<hr/>					
Issue title:	Conformance classes and AIM subsets				Class'n: major technical
Description					
AIMs are written in EXPRESS.					
AIMs have graphical, short and annotated forms.					
Conformance classes are subsets of AIMs.					
Conformance classes are written in EXPRESS.					
Do/should conformance classes have graphical, short and/or annotated forms?					
Proposed resolution:					
Actual resolution:					
Commentary					
Implemented:	Date resolved:		03/19/96		
<hr/>					
Issue number:	180	Raised by:	Alison McKay	Date:	13-Dec-95
Document N:	40	Clause(s):	12	Status:	open
<hr/>					
Issue title:	ATS and physical file				Class'n: minor technical
Description					
Note 4: How can an ABSTRACT test suite be written in PHYSICAL file format?					
Proposed resolution:					
Actual resolution:					
Commentary					
Implemented:	Date resolved:				
<hr/>					
Issue number:	181	Raised by:	Alison McKay	Date:	13-Dec-95
Document N:	40	Clause(s):	14.4	Status:	open
<hr/>					
Issue title:	UOFs and integration of APs				Class'n: editorial
Description					
Note 1: We're not sure that the content of this note is true. Does this note require expansion or deletion? We think deletion. If expansion, suggested text is required.					
Proposed resolution:					
Actual resolution:					
Commentary					
Implemented:	Date resolved:				

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	182	<u>Raised by:</u>	Alison McKay	<u>Date:</u>	13-Dec-95
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	18	<u>Status:</u>	open

<u>Issue title:</u>	Implementation principles	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
----------------------------	---------------------------	------------------------	-----------------

Description

The committee needs to think what is the appropriate form and content for this clause. We propose replacing from 18.4 (inclusive) to the end of the clause with a reference to the source document.

Proposed resolution:

Actual resolution:

Commentary

Implemented: **Date resolved:**

<u>Issue number:</u>	183	<u>Raised by:</u>	Julian Fowler	<u>Date:</u>	17-Jan-95
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	8	<u>Status:</u>	open

<u>Issue title:</u>	Architectural components	<u>Class'n:</u>	major technical
----------------------------	--------------------------	------------------------	-----------------

Description

From the start of work on Part 13, WG5/P1 and WG10/P1 have attempted to distinguish carefully between the data architecture of STEP and its document architecture. Clause 6 in N13 identified the components of the data architecture as AAM, ARM, AIM (consisting of AIM EXPRESS plus mapping table), IR, AIC, Conformance Class, ATS. Clause 8 of N40 has reverted to the document structure.

Proposed resolution:

Update the text of clause 6 from N13 and substitute for clause 8 in N40.

Actual resolution:

Commentary

Implemented: **Date resolved:**

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

Issue number:	184	Raised by:	Julian Fowler	Date:	17-Jan-95
Document N:	40	Clause(s):	general	Status:	closed

Issue title:	Traceability of issues and their resolutions.	Class'n:	editorial
---------------------	---	-----------------	-----------

Description

The absence of a maintained issues log has made it very difficult to track the changes to the document. In particular, little of the text against which issues were raised at the Washington meeting (N13) remains, and it is not possible to determine whether change results from response to issues or to more general rewriting.

Proposed resolution:

(a) a complete issues log should be maintained

(b) further change to the document should only be undertaken in response to specific issues (i.e., "generic" issues should be sent back to authors for clarification).

(c) subsequent versions of the document should use change bars (or equivalent) to indicate changes and to track them to specific issues.

Actual resolution:

An issues log for the document is now being maintained.

Commentary

N41 documents the state of issues at the time of distribution of N40

N50 documents the state of issues at the time of completion of N62

Implemented:	N41, N	Date resolved:	03/19/96
---------------------	--------	-----------------------	----------

Issue number:	185	Raised by:	Howard Mason	Date:	01-Jan-96
Document N:	40	Clause(s):	general	Status:	closed

Issue title:	Use of jargon	Class'n:	editorial
---------------------	---------------	-----------------	-----------

Description

The document makes extensive use of jargon, which is perhaps inevitable, but this should be consistently used and explained in advance of its use, rather than jumping to annexes or other clauses to find the explanations. The current document is confusing and repetitious - perhaps as the sorted version of a number of different inputs.

Proposed resolution:

Actual resolution:

Revisions to structure and content in N62 address this issue.

Commentary

Implemented:	N62	Date resolved:	03/01/96
---------------------	-----	-----------------------	----------

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	186	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	5	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Stucture of clause 5	<u>Class'n:</u>	editorial
----------------------------	----------------------	------------------------	-----------

Description

Clause 5 sets out the basic structure of the document, and is basicly unrecognisable as such.

Proposed resolution:

I suggest that a less user-diabolical approach would be to establish the industry demands, derive the characteristics of the implied technical solution, and then to describe the development methodology to achieve that solution. Such a structure would serve to decouple the technical and methodological aspects.

Actual resolution:

Revisions to structure and content in N62 address this issue.

Commentary

<u>Implemented:</u>	N62	<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/01/96
----------------------------	-----	------------------------------	----------

<u>Issue number:</u>	187	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	general	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Conflict with scope statement	<u>Class'n:</u>	editorial
----------------------------	-------------------------------	------------------------	-----------

Description

There seems to be conflict between the scope statements and the other text on the extent to which the implementation methods are included.

Proposed resolution:

It is essential to cover the architectural aspects and implications of this part of the standard, but the text is confusing.

Actual resolution:

Revisions to structure and content in N62 address this issue.

Commentary

<u>Implemented:</u>	N62	<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/01/96
----------------------------	-----	------------------------------	----------

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	188	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	Introduction	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Improvement of ISO 10303	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
<u>Description</u> Page viii, first bullet of second list. Improvement of ISO 10303 or development and extension of ISO 10303? (Otherwise contradicts the definition of a standard).			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u> Revisions to structure and content in N62 address this issue.			
<u>Commentary</u>			
<u>Implemented:</u>	N62	<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/01/96

<u>Issue number:</u>	189	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	Introduction	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Target audience	<u>Class'n:</u>	editorial
<u>Description</u> Page ix, first bullet: what is meant by ISO 10303 part leaders -- project leaders? part editors?			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u> Revisions to structure and content in N62 address this issue.			
<u>Commentary</u>			
<u>Implemented:</u>	N62	<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/01/96

<u>Issue number:</u>	190	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	Introduction	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Target audience	<u>Class'n:</u>	editorial
<u>Description</u> Page ix, third bullet -- are ISO 10303 developers domain experts, or something else?			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u> Revisions to structure and content in N62 address this issue.			
<u>Commentary</u>			
<u>Implemented:</u>	N62	<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/01/96

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	191	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	1	<u>Status:</u>	open
<u>Issue title:</u>	Scope of Part 13				<u>Class'n:</u> minor technical
<u>Description</u>	First bullet of the scope statement -- registration as a CD? DIS? IS?				
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>					
<u>Actual resolution:</u>					
<u>Commentary</u>					
<u>Implemented:</u>	<u>Date resolved:</u>				
<u>Issue number:</u>	192	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	1	<u>Status:</u>	closed
<u>Issue title:</u>	Note 1 is not a note!				<u>Class'n:</u> editorial
<u>Description</u>	The contents of note 1 (page 1) are normative, not informative. Note 2 (same page) has no added value.				
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>	Make the text of note 1 part of the 1st paragraph of the scope statement. Delete note 2.				
<u>Actual resolution:</u>	Revisions to structure and content in N62 address this issue.				
<u>Commentary</u>					
<u>Implemented:</u>	N62	<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/01/96		
<u>Issue number:</u>	193	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	1	<u>Status:</u>	closed
<u>Issue title:</u>	Development of conformance classes				<u>Class'n:</u> editorial
<u>Description</u>	Reword the first bullet after note 2.				
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>	- methods for designing ISO 10303 conformance classes				
<u>Actual resolution:</u>	Revisions to structure and content in N62 address this issue.				
<u>Commentary</u>	JPF: personally I would prefer "discovering" -- see my proposed resolution to issue #161.				
<u>Implemented:</u>	N62	<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/01/96		

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	194	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	1	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Exclusion of abstract test methods	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
<u>Description</u>	Are abstract test methods themselves excluded from scope?		
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>	Revisions to structure and content in N62 address this issue.		
<u>Commentary</u>	JPF: yes, they are -- include a statement to that effect with a note that abstract test methods are defined in parts 34, 35		
<u>Implemented:</u>	N62	<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/19/96

<u>Issue number:</u>	195	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	1	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Differentiate between different architectures	<u>Class'n:</u>	editorial
<u>Description</u>	Last bullet point on page 1 -- change to:		
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>	- system architectures and methods ...		
<u>Actual resolution:</u>	Revisions to structure and content in N62 address this issue.		
<u>Commentary</u>			
<u>Implemented:</u>	N62	<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/19/96

<u>Issue number:</u>	196	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	3	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	numbering of definitions	<u>Class'n:</u>	editorial
<u>Description</u>	Clause numbering seems odd ... is this ISO.STY or your use of it?		
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>	Revisions to structure and content in N62 address this issue.		
<u>Commentary</u>			
<u>Implemented:</u>	N62	<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/01/96

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	197	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	3.6	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Definitions relating to integration	<u>Class'n:</u>	editorial
<u>Description</u> These aren't really definitions -- they expound the principles of integration. The underlying definitions are missing -- this is explanation, not definition. This is definition of principles -- needs more text to be intelligible to anyone who has read this far.			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u> Revisions to structure and content in N62 address this issue.			
<u>Commentary</u> JPF: in N22 we had a clause "Design principles ...". Can this be re-introduced between clauses 5 and 6 (or as an additional subclause of 5) as the right place to put 3.6 and 3.7?			
<u>Implemented:</u>	N62	<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/01/96

<u>Issue number:</u>	198	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	3.6.8	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Use text not notes	<u>Class'n:</u>	editorial
<u>Description</u> Notes 1-3 are normative, not informative.			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u> Revisions to structure and content in N62 address this issue.			
<u>Commentary</u>			
<u>Implemented:</u>	N62	<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/01/96

<u>Issue number:</u>	199	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	3.6.11	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Definition of "conceptual"	<u>Class'n:</u>	editorial
<u>Description</u> The term "conceptual" as applied to integrated resource constructs should be defined.			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u> Revisions to structure and content in N62 address this issue.			
<u>Commentary</u>			
<u>Implemented:</u>	N62	<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/01/96

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

Issue number:	200	Raised by:	Howard Mason	Date:	01-Jan-96
Document N:	40	Clause(s):	3.6.11, 3.6.14	Status:	closed

Issue title:	Context-independent nature of IR constructs	Class'n:	editorial
---------------------	---	-----------------	-----------

Description

3.6.11: "These constructs do not include ideas or mechanisms ...".

3.6.14, Note 6 "... the represented concepts are free of any specific application context".

Very bold statements!

Proposed resolution:

Actual resolution:

Revisions to structure and content in N62 address this issue.

Commentary

Implemented:	N62	Date resolved:	03/01/96
---------------------	-----	-----------------------	----------

Issue number:	201	Raised by:	Howard Mason	Date:	01-Jan-96
Document N:	40	Clause(s):	4	Status:	closed

Issue title:	Reference to IGES	Class'n:	editorial
---------------------	-------------------	-----------------	-----------

Description

IGES is defined as an abbreviation in clause 4: where is this used?

Proposed resolution:

Actual resolution:

Revisions to structure and content in N62 address this issue.

Commentary

JPF: IGES is referenced within Note 2 at the bottom of page 13 (N40).

Implemented:	N62	Date resolved:	03/01/96
---------------------	-----	-----------------------	----------

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	202	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	5	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Structure and content of clause 5	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
----------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------------	-----------------

Description

The previous version [N30] was bad, but better than this! Section 5 needs to cover:

- (A) Industrial demands -- business level
- (B) Implied technical solution -- characteristics of ISO 10303
- (C) Development methodology for that solution

Proposed resolution:

Restructure clause 5 under the headings as above:

(A): 5.1.2 (a)-(e), 5.1.3 (product data exchange, product data sharing, product data archiving), 5.2.2 (c)-(e), (g), 5.3.2 (f)

(B): 5.1.2 (h)-(k), (m)-(q), 5.1.3 (Note 3 from "ISO 10303 application protocols ..." onwards), (product data representation), 5.2.2 (a),(b),(f)-(n),

Actual resolution:

Revisions to structure and content in N62 address this issue.

Commentary

<u>Implemented:</u>	N62	<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/01/96
----------------------------	-----	------------------------------	----------

<u>Issue number:</u>	203	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	5.1.2	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Definition of archiving	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
----------------------------	-------------------------	------------------------	-----------------

Description

5.1.2 (b) -- the requirement for "complete archiving of such data" is not defined

Proposed resolution:

Actual resolution:

Revisions to structure and content in N62 address this issue.

Commentary

<u>Implemented:</u>	N62	<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/01/96
----------------------------	-----	------------------------------	----------

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	204	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	5	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Requirements for ISO 10303	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
<u>Description</u>			
Clause 5 should cover the requirements given at the start of the project.			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>			
Revisions to structure and content in N62 address this issue.			
<u>Commentary</u>			
JPF: does "the project" here refer to the ISO project that is developing Part 13,. or to the BSI project that is supporting the development of the first draft.			
<u>Implemented:</u>	N62	<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/01/96

<u>Issue number:</u>	205	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	5.1.2	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Availability of implementations	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
<u>Description</u>			
Does 5.1.2 (g) say anything more than that the standard needs to be implemented?			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>			
Revisions to structure and content in N62 address this issue.			
<u>Commentary</u>			
JPF: I think that this relates to my issue #172, and the "STEP-centric" viewpoint of clause 5. Remember that industry benefits come from more effective/efficient exchange, sharing & management of product information, not from the existence of STEP or the availability of implementations.			
<u>Implemented:</u>	N62	<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/01/96

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	206	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	5.1.2	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Figure 1 is misleading	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
<u>Description</u> Figure 1 does not show how the role of the AP is to provide the data specification for neutral communication between the two applications.			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u> Revisions to structure and content in N62 address this issue.			
<u>Commentary</u> JPF: the description of the issue is my interpretation of HGM's redrawing of the diagram!			
<u>Implemented:</u>	N62	<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/01/96

<u>Issue number:</u>	207	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	5.1.3	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Data exchange vs. data sharing	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
<u>Description</u> Need to explain to the rest of the world why there is such a fundamental difference between exchange and sharing.			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u> Revisions to structure and content in N62 address this issue.			
<u>Commentary</u>			
<u>Implemented:</u>	N62	<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/01/96

<u>Issue number:</u>	208	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	5.2	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Scope and contents of 5.2	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
<u>Description</u> 5.2 should describe the technical shape of the standard -- including the implementation methods and conformance testing.			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u> Revisions to structure and content in N62 address this issue.			
<u>Commentary</u>			
<u>Implemented:</u>	N62	<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/01/96

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	209	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	5.2.2	<u>Status:</u>	open
<hr/>					
<u>Issue title:</u>	ISO and industry requirements				<u>Class'n:</u> minor technical
<u>Description</u>					
5.2.2 (k): industry requires compatibility with other standards (this goes into category A in issue #202). Note 3: how is compatibility with ANSI SPARC an ISO requirement?					
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>					
<u>Actual resolution:</u>					
Revisions to structure and content in N62 address this issue.					
<u>Commentary</u>					
JPF: there is a broader issue here (which Felix Metzger raised in his comments on WG10 N31) -- what *is* the relationship to ANSI/SPARC? I suspect that there are few involved in STEP architecture/methodology development who accept that there is anything more than an analogy with the ANSI/SPARC three schema architecture.					
<u>Implemented:</u>	N62	<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/01/96		
<hr/>					
<u>Issue number:</u>	210	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	5.2.2	<u>Status:</u>	closed
<hr/>					
<u>Issue title:</u>	Complexity and size of data specifications				<u>Class'n:</u> minor technical
<u>Description</u>					
5.2.2 (l): size of the data specifications ... in pages? complexity? what?					
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>					
<u>Actual resolution:</u>					
Revisions to structure and content in N62 address this issue.					
<u>Commentary</u>					
<u>Implemented:</u>	N62	<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/01/96		
<hr/>					
<u>Issue number:</u>	211	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	5.2.2	<u>Status:</u>	closed
<hr/>					
<u>Issue title:</u>	Relationships between concepts				<u>Class'n:</u> minor technical
<u>Description</u>					
Explain the relationships between the concepts set out in 5.2.2.					
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>					
<u>Actual resolution:</u>					
Revisions to structure and content in N62 address this issue.					
<u>Commentary</u>					
<u>Implemented:</u>	N62	<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/01/96		

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	212	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	5.3	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Traceability of 5.3 to earlier clauses	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
<u>Description</u>			
5.3 should be traceable to 5.2 and then to 5.1.			
5.3 should say what needs to be done in the methods to support the technical shape in 5.2!			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>			
Revisions to structure and content in N62 address this issue.			
<u>Commentary</u>			
<u>Implemented:</u>	N62	<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/01/96

<u>Issue number:</u>	213	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	5.3.2	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Is conformance testing in scope?	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
<u>Description</u>			
5.3.2 (n) discusses conformance and other types of testing. This is declared out of scope in clause 1!			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>			
Revisions to structure and content in N62 address this issue.			
<u>Commentary</u>			
<u>Implemented:</u>	N62	<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/01/96

<u>Issue number:</u>	214	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	5.3.3	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Development methods -- fundamental concepts	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
<u>Description</u>			
Perhaps this is the place to actually explain what integration and interpretation are at the level of the definitions only. Also definitions of "aspects" and "data specification architecture".			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>			
Revisions to structure and content in N62 address this issue.			
<u>Commentary</u>			
JPF: see my comment on issue #197.			
<u>Implemented:</u>	N62	<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/01/96

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	215	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	6	<u>Status:</u>	open

<u>Issue title:</u>	Scope and content of Section I	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
----------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------	-----------------

Description

Clause 6 says "this part only covers data architecture (a)" -- not true! What about implementation, conformance testing? Clause 6 (c) references implementation methods, but this is not in the declared scope [clause 1]. Note 1 is more than a note, and contradicts the scope statement!

Figure 3 contradicts clause 6 => change clause 6.

Proposed resolution:

Actual resolution:

Commentary

Implemented:

Date resolved:

<u>Issue number:</u>	216	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	7	<u>Status:</u>	open

<u>Issue title:</u>	Concept of application context is not defined.	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
----------------------------	--	------------------------	-----------------

Description

The concept of an application context should be introduced before it is used.

Proposed resolution:

Actual resolution:

Commentary

Implemented:

Date resolved:

<u>Issue number:</u>	217	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	7	<u>Status:</u>	open

<u>Issue title:</u>	Content of clause 7	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
----------------------------	---------------------	------------------------	-----------------

Description

Clause 7 needs to be more user friendly -- more than relationships between definitions.

Proposed resolution:

Actual resolution:

Commentary

Implemented:

Date resolved:

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	218	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	8	<u>Status:</u>	open

<u>Issue title:</u>	Standard data specifications	<u>Class'n:</u>	editorial
<u>Description</u> First line of clause 8 -- are there non-standard data specifications?			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>			
<u>Commentary</u> JPF: see my issue #183. There are, in a sense "non standard" data specifications -- the AAM and ARM, which are informative only.			
<u>Implemented:</u>	<u>Date resolved:</u>		

<u>Issue number:</u>	219	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	9	<u>Status:</u>	open

<u>Issue title:</u>	Definition of application protocol	<u>Class'n:</u>	editorial
<u>Description</u> First paragraph of clause 9: is this the standard definition? Needs to be explained.			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>			
<u>Commentary</u>			
<u>Implemented:</u>	<u>Date resolved:</u>		

<u>Issue number:</u>	220	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	9.1	<u>Status:</u>	open

<u>Issue title:</u>	Scope of an application protocol	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
<u>Description</u> 9.1 implies a scope that is minimal, and extended, rather than planning for broad use. The scope may cover more than one life-cycle stage. The scope should be defined in user-recognisable natural language.			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>			
<u>Commentary</u> Clarification is sought from the issue author			
<u>Implemented:</u>	<u>Date resolved:</u>		

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	221	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	9.2	<u>Status:</u>	open

<u>Issue title:</u>	Application activity models	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
<u>Description</u>			
First line of 9.2: what are "general enterprise activities"?			
Second paragraph includes duplication. "... in-scope activities ..." is jargon.			
Note 1 is part of the description, not a note.			
Note 4 -- why are the points of overlap not explicitly identified?			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>			
<u>Commentary</u>			
<u>Implemented:</u>	<u>Date resolved:</u>		

<u>Issue number:</u>	222	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	9.3	<u>Status:</u>	open

<u>Issue title:</u>	Description of ARM	<u>Class'n:</u>	editorial
<u>Description</u>			
9.3, second paragraph, first line: change to "... analysis of the information requirements ...".			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>			
<u>Commentary</u>			
<u>Implemented:</u>	<u>Date resolved:</u>		

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	223	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	9.4.1	<u>Status:</u>	open

<u>Issue title:</u>	Description of mapping table	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
----------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------	-----------------

Description

9.4.1, first paragraph: add at end "... from the integrated resources by interpretation".

From end of second paragraph "The mapping table includes ..." to paragraph before Note 1 -- text should be integrated.

Proposed resolution:

Actual resolution:

Commentary

JPF: there is a problem with clause numbering: Mapping Table should not be a sub-clause of UOF.

<u>Implemented:</u>	<u>Date resolved:</u>
----------------------------	------------------------------

<u>Issue number:</u>	224	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	9.5	<u>Status:</u>	open

<u>Issue title:</u>	Description of AIM	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
----------------------------	--------------------	------------------------	-----------------

Description

Second paragraph on p.25 has duplications.

Note 2 and the preceding paragraph use the term "conceptual" which has not been defined.

Example 14 should state that primary and foreign keys won't be found in an AIM.

Paragraph following example 15, second line: change to "... the use of common units of functionality ...".

Last two paragraphs on page 15 should be expanded.

Proposed resolution:

Actual resolution:

Commentary

JPF: see also issues #25 (consistent terminology) and #129 (short form vs. long form).

<u>Implemented:</u>	<u>Date resolved:</u>
----------------------------	------------------------------

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	225	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	10	<u>Status:</u>	open

<u>Issue title:</u>	Description of Integrated Resources	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
----------------------------	-------------------------------------	------------------------	-----------------

Description

Clause 10, second paragraph uses the term "conceptual" which has not been defined.

Paragraph following Note 1: change "... combined and refined to meet a specific need." to "... interpreted.".

Next paragraph: what classification?

Proposed resolution:

Actual resolution:

Commentary

Implemented:

Date resolved:

<u>Issue number:</u>	226	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	11	<u>Status:</u>	open

<u>Issue title:</u>	Description of AICs	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
----------------------------	---------------------	------------------------	-----------------

Description

Text in clause 11 needs to be integrated, duplication eliminated.

Note 1 needs to be expanded -- AICs may be designed in through units of functionality or identified during interpretation.

Notes should use the same form of text as other notes.

Proposed resolution:

Actual resolution:

Commentary

Implemented:

Date resolved:

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	227	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	13	<u>Status:</u>	open
<hr/>					
<u>Issue title:</u>	Scope and content of Section II				<u>Class'n:</u> minor technical
<u>Description</u>					
See comments on clause 6/scope and content of section I (issue #215). Clause 13 contradicts the scope statement.					
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>					
<u>Actual resolution:</u>					
<u>Commentary</u>					
<u>Implemented:</u>	<u>Date resolved:</u>				
<hr/>					
<u>Issue number:</u>	228	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	14	<u>Status:</u>	open
<hr/>					
<u>Issue title:</u>	AP development methods				<u>Class'n:</u> minor technical
<u>Description</u>					
First paragraph of clause 14: add at end "... using methods defined in clauses 15 and 16."					
Paragraph following Note 2 -- use same words as clause 9. Did we miss the definition of usage scenario in 9.2?					
Note 6 -- applies to ISO APs only, can't preclude other uses.					
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>					
<u>Actual resolution:</u>					
<u>Commentary</u>					
<u>Implemented:</u>	<u>Date resolved:</u>				
<hr/>					
<u>Issue number:</u>	229	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	14.1	<u>Status:</u>	open
<hr/>					
<u>Issue title:</u>	Duplicate notes				<u>Class'n:</u> editorial
<u>Description</u>					
Note 3 in clause 14.1 duplicates Note 2.					
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>					
<u>Actual resolution:</u>					
<u>Commentary</u>					
<u>Implemented:</u>	<u>Date resolved:</u>				

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	230	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	14.3	<u>Status:</u>	open
<hr/>					
<u>Issue title:</u>	ARM development methods				<u>Class'n:</u> minor technical
<u>Description</u>					
First line of 14.3: change to "... is derived from its scope ...".					
Integrate text from para following Note 1 to Note 2.					
Paragraph starting "The example product data ...": how do usage tests relate to scenarios?					
Note 4: is a "reference path" here the same as that described in 9.4.1?					
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>					
<u>Actual resolution:</u>					
<u>Commentary</u>					
<u>Implemented:</u>		<u>Date resolved:</u>			
<hr/>					
<u>Issue number:</u>	231	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	14.4	<u>Status:</u>	open
<hr/>					
<u>Issue title:</u>	Characteristics of UOFs				<u>Class'n:</u> minor technical
<u>Description</u>					
What are the characteristics of a UOF?					
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>					
<u>Actual resolution:</u>					
<u>Commentary</u>					
<u>Implemented:</u>		<u>Date resolved:</u>			
<hr/>					
<u>Issue number:</u>	232	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	14.5	<u>Status:</u>	open
<hr/>					
<u>Issue title:</u>	Mapping table development				<u>Class'n:</u> minor technical
<u>Description</u>					
First two sentences of 14.5: "... development of the application interpreted model."; "... the interpretation process". -- are these the same thing?					
Second paragraph: see issue #231 re: multiple use of "reference path".					
Should mapping table method be documented after AIM method?					
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>					
<u>Actual resolution:</u>					
<u>Commentary</u>					
<u>Implemented:</u>		<u>Date resolved:</u>			

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	233	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	14.6	<u>Status:</u>	open
<u>Issue title:</u>	AIM development methods				<u>Class'n:</u> minor technical
<u>Description</u>	14.6, note 1: what is the role of AICs? How is the need for new IRs identified?				
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>					
<u>Actual resolution:</u>					
<u>Commentary</u>					
<u>Implemented:</u>	<u>Date resolved:</u>				
<u>Issue number:</u>	234	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	14.7	<u>Status:</u>	open
<u>Issue title:</u>	Conformance classes and AICs				<u>Class'n:</u> minor technical
<u>Description</u>	Is a conformance class a collection of AICs?				
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>					
<u>Actual resolution:</u>					
<u>Commentary</u>					
<u>Implemented:</u>	<u>Date resolved:</u>				
<u>Issue number:</u>	235	<u>Raised by:</u>	Julian Fowler	<u>Date:</u>	17-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	14.6	<u>Status:</u>	open
<u>Issue title:</u>	Sequential nature of interpretation				<u>Class'n:</u> minor technical
<u>Description</u>	The identification of activities (a), (b) and (c) in 14.6 implies a sequential activity applied to the entire ARM. In fact, the interpretation method applies (a), (b) and (c) as appropriate to each application object.				
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>	Add before Note 4: The activities described above are applied to each application object (including its attributes and relationships) until all information requirements have been considered and interpreted.				
<u>Actual resolution:</u>					
<u>Commentary</u>					
<u>Implemented:</u>	<u>Date resolved:</u>				

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	236	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	15	<u>Status:</u>	open

<u>Issue title:</u>	IR development method	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
<u>Description</u>			
What is the relationship between IR development and AP/AIM development?			
The fuller explanation [given in N30] was much more useful.			
Note 3 is jargon.			
15 (c): the term "data specification architecture" is not yet defined.			
15 (e): what does this mean?			
Note 11: this needs to be explained earlier.			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>			
<u>Commentary</u>			
<u>Implemented:</u>	<u>Date resolved:</u>		

<u>Issue number:</u>	237	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	16.1	<u>Status:</u>	open

<u>Issue title:</u>	AIC development	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
<u>Description</u>			
First line of 16.1: change to "... is based upon identification of equivalent information requirements ...".			
Para. following Example 24: relationship to UOFs?			
16.1 (b): should the term "global rule" be defined somewhere?			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>			
<u>Commentary</u>			
<u>Implemented:</u>	<u>Date resolved:</u>		

<u>Issue number:</u>	238	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	16.2	<u>Status:</u>	open

<u>Issue title:</u>	AIC usage	<u>Class'n:</u>	editorial
<u>Description</u>			
Integrate Notes 2 and 3.			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>			
<u>Commentary</u>			
<u>Implemented:</u>	<u>Date resolved:</u>		

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	239	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	17	<u>Status:</u>	open
<hr/>					
<u>Issue title:</u>	ATS development				<u>Class'n:</u> minor technical
<u>Description</u> Clause 17 should refer back to earlier sections. What's the relevance of Example 27?					
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>					
<u>Actual resolution:</u>					
<u>Commentary</u>					
<u>Implemented:</u>		<u>Date resolved:</u>			
<hr/>					
<u>Issue number:</u>	240	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	18.1	<u>Status:</u>	open
<hr/>					
<u>Issue title:</u>	Implementation assumptions				<u>Class'n:</u> minor technical
<u>Description</u> 18.1 (a): is this an historical perspective? 18.2 (b): "product data aspect" is not well defined.					
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>					
<u>Actual resolution:</u>					
<u>Commentary</u>					
<u>Implemented:</u>		<u>Date resolved:</u>			
<hr/>					
<u>Issue number:</u>	241	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	18.3	<u>Status:</u>	open
<hr/>					
<u>Issue title:</u>	Implementation methods				<u>Class'n:</u> minor technical
<u>Description</u> Clause 18.3 needs to be expanded.					
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>					
<u>Actual resolution:</u>					
<u>Commentary</u>					
<u>Implemented:</u>		<u>Date resolved:</u>			

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	242	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	18.4	<u>Status:</u>	open
<u>Issue title:</u>	Clause numbering				<u>Class'n:</u> editorial
<u>Description</u>	Numbering of sub-clauses in 18.4 is wrong.				
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>	18.4.2 should be 18.4.1.2 18.4.3 should be 18.4.2				
<u>Actual resolution:</u>					
<u>Commentary</u>					
<u>Implemented:</u>	<u>Date resolved:</u>				
<u>Issue number:</u>	243	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	18.4	<u>Status:</u>	open
<u>Issue title:</u>	Implementation approaches				<u>Class'n:</u> editorial
<u>Description</u>	18.4 needs to introduce 18.4.3.				
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>					
<u>Actual resolution:</u>					
<u>Commentary</u>					
<u>Implemented:</u>	<u>Date resolved:</u>				
<u>Issue number:</u>	244	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	18.4.1, 18.5	<u>Status:</u>	open
<u>Issue title:</u>	Data exchange and data sharing				<u>Class'n:</u> minor technical
<u>Description</u>	Clauses 18.4.1.1 and 18.4.2 do not achieve the stated goal of distinguishing between data exchange and data sharing. It is not clear to me what is the impact of the somewhat arbitrary distinction that has been made between exchange and sharing. 18.5 says no difference.				
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>					
<u>Actual resolution:</u>					
<u>Commentary</u>					
<u>Implemented:</u>	<u>Date resolved:</u>				

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	245	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	18.4.1.1	<u>Status:</u>	open
<hr/>					
<u>Issue title:</u>	Computing environments				<u>Class'n:</u> editorial
<u>Description</u>					
What about ancient computing environments??					
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>					
<u>Actual resolution:</u>					
<u>Commentary</u>					
<u>Implemented:</u>		<u>Date resolved:</u>			
<hr/>					
<u>Issue number:</u>	246	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	18.4.2	<u>Status:</u>	open
<hr/>					
<u>Issue title:</u>	Data sharing				<u>Class'n:</u> editorial
<u>Description</u>					
First paragraph of 18.4.2 needs to be better structured.					
Last line of page 42: first use of "data instantiation rules"?					
Second paragraph on page 43: one of which mappings?					
Last para. of 18.4.2: shouldn't this be earlier?					
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>					
<u>Actual resolution:</u>					
<u>Commentary</u>					
<u>Implemented:</u>		<u>Date resolved:</u>			
<hr/>					
<u>Issue number:</u>	247	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	18.5.2.1	<u>Status:</u>	open
<hr/>					
<u>Issue title:</u>	AIM schema merging				<u>Class'n:</u>
<u>Description</u>					
Page 46 - this is an issues log, not a method. Rewrite to give the answers.					
Define what "syntactic issues" are.					
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>					
E.g., reword the last para. of 18.5.2.1 as "Two part 21 files cannot be merged because ...".					
<u>Actual resolution:</u>					
<u>Commentary</u>					
<u>Implemented:</u>		<u>Date resolved:</u>			

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	248	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	18.5.2.2	<u>Status:</u>	open
<u>Issue title:</u>	Conformance criteria				<u>Class'n:</u> editorial
<u>Description</u>	First line of 18.5.2.2: change to "... address conformance testing of implementations ...".				
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>					
<u>Actual resolution:</u>					
<u>Commentary</u>					
<u>Implemented:</u>	<u>Date resolved:</u>				
<u>Issue number:</u>	249	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	18.6	<u>Status:</u>	open
<u>Issue title:</u>	System architecture				<u>Class'n:</u> editorial
<u>Description</u>	Reword start of 18.6.				
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>	Change first sentence to "... there is a generic data management function ...". Delete second sentence.				
<u>Actual resolution:</u>					
<u>Commentary</u>					
<u>Implemented:</u>	<u>Date resolved:</u>				
<u>Issue number:</u>	250	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	18.6	<u>Status:</u>	open
<u>Issue title:</u>	System architecture and conceptual schema				<u>Class'n:</u> minor technical
<u>Description</u>	18.6 (a): which conceptual schema -- not mentioned in clause 14.				
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>					
<u>Actual resolution:</u>					
<u>Commentary</u>					
<u>Implemented:</u>	<u>Date resolved:</u>				

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	251	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	18.6	<u>Status:</u>	open
<hr/>					
<u>Issue title:</u>	System architectures				<u>Class'n:</u> minor technical
<u>Description</u>					
The scenarios illustrated by figures 5 and 6 need more explanation to be meaningful.					
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>					
<u>Actual resolution:</u>					
<u>Commentary</u>					
<u>Implemented:</u>					
<u>Date resolved:</u>					
<hr/>					
<u>Issue number:</u>	252	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	Annex B	<u>Status:</u>	open
<hr/>					
<u>Issue title:</u>	Data specification architecture				<u>Class'n:</u> minor technical
<u>Description</u>					
Should this be introduced/defined much earlier?					
Note 1 is not a note.					
The various aspects of the architecture should be defined. They are in Annex G (informative_ but should be in the main text.					
Point (a) on page 52: what does this mean??					
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>					
<u>Actual resolution:</u>					
<u>Commentary</u>					
<u>Implemented:</u>					
<u>Date resolved:</u>					
<hr/>					
<u>Issue number:</u>	253	<u>Raised by:</u>	Howard Mason	<u>Date:</u>	01-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	Annex E	<u>Status:</u>	open
<hr/>					
<u>Issue title:</u>	Generic product description resource				<u>Class'n:</u> minor technical
<u>Description</u>					
This should be in the main body of the text, with the framework descriptions and also in definitions.					
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>					
<u>Actual resolution:</u>					
<u>Commentary</u>					
<u>Implemented:</u>					
<u>Date resolved:</u>					

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	254	<u>Raised by:</u>	Julian Fowler	<u>Date:</u>	17-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	Annexes D.1 and E	<u>Status:</u>	open

<u>Issue title:</u>	Example comes before concept description	<u>Class'n:</u>	editorial
<u>Description</u>	Annex D.1 illustrates the concepts described in Annex E.		
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>	Move D.1 to become E.2 (existing E becomes E.1).		
<u>Actual resolution:</u>			
<u>Commentary</u>			
<u>Implemented:</u>	<u>Date resolved:</u>		

<u>Issue number:</u>	255	<u>Raised by:</u>	Julian Fowler	<u>Date:</u>	17-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	Annex E	<u>Status:</u>	open

<u>Issue title:</u>	GPDM vs. GPDR	<u>Class'n:</u>	major technical
<u>Description</u>	I continue to believe that there is a distinction between the GPD_M_ as a meta-model for the STEP IRs and the GPD_R_, which is an instantiation of the GPDM for the initial release of STEP. The GPDM should be stable (indeed, stability should be a criterion for its correctness), while the GPDR may (and does) evolve and expand.		
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>	Document the difference between GPDM and GPDR.		
<u>Actual resolution:</u>			
<u>Commentary</u>			
<u>Implemented:</u>	<u>Date resolved:</u>		

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	256	<u>Raised by:</u>	Bill Burkett	<u>Date:</u>	20-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	3	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Definition of 'data specification'	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
----------------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------	-----------------

Description

The definition clause is good, but it's missing some definitions:

- data specification

Proposed resolution:

data specification: an EXPRESS schema or schemas the governs the physical format of a bounded set of data.
(Note: this definition encompasses both the IRs and AIMs).

Actual resolution:

Add the term as proposed. Reword the definition as:
"A formally defined model bounding a set of data".
EXAMPLE - a model defined as an EXPRESS schema is a data specification.

Commentary

JPF: The example given in N62 refers to data specification *languages*. Are two examples required, one as in N62 and one as above?

Implemented: N62 **Date resolved:** 03/01/96

<u>Issue number:</u>	257	<u>Raised by:</u>	Bill Burkett	<u>Date:</u>	20-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	3.6.15, 3.6.17	<u>Status:</u>	open

<u>Issue title:</u>	Different types of constraint	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
----------------------------	-------------------------------	------------------------	-----------------

Description

The definitions for subject-area constraint and integrated resource constraint specification do not differentiate between the two. The definitions need to be made clearer.

Proposed resolution:

not sure what they are, so am unable to propose solution

Actual resolution:

Commentary

WG10/P1, Dallas: We will track these definitions back to whatever source documents are available. We need to cover subject area constrain as used on page 35 and domain constraint as used on page 38. What is the meaning of domain in this document and is it used consistently here? (Application domain vs. domain constraint). On this subject we will use the term application area for application domain and reserve the use of domain in its more mathematical sense, i.e., a range of population. Do we need to make comparison between constraints in resources and constraints in interpreted models?

Implemented: **Date resolved:**

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	258	<u>Raised by:</u>	Bill Burkett	<u>Date:</u>	20-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	3.6.16	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	IR requirements	<u>Class'n:</u>	editorial
----------------------------	-----------------	------------------------	-----------

Description

The IRs don't document requirements, therefore the phrase "...the division of the requirements documented in ..." is misleading and inaccurate.

Proposed resolution:

Replace "requirements" with "constructs" or reword.

Actual resolution:

Reword as "... the division of a draft resource model ...".

Commentary

Relevant clause in N62 is 5.1.21

<u>Implemented:</u>	N62	<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/01/96
----------------------------	-----	------------------------------	----------

<u>Issue number:</u>	259	<u>Raised by:</u>	Bill Burkett	<u>Date:</u>	20-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	3.7.20	<u>Status:</u>	open

<u>Issue title:</u>	Relationship instances	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
----------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	-----------------

Description

What's a "relationship instance"? (many of the definitions in clause 3.7 are a little squirrely in this regard - although it's nice that these terms are being defined, the definitions really don't help much because they don't mean anything.)

Proposed resolution:

Actual resolution:

Commentary

WG10/P1, Dallas: This issue will be resolved when issue 197 dealing with relocating certain definitions to the body of the document is resolved.

JPF: The clause affected is 14.6.9 in N62. Text has been reworded but does not resolved the issue.

<u>Implemented:</u>		<u>Date resolved:</u>	
----------------------------	--	------------------------------	--

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

Issue number:	260	Raised by:	Bill Burkett	Date:	20-Jan-96
Document N:	40	Clause(s):	5.1.2, 5.2.2, 5.3.2	Status:	closed

Issue title: Assumptions vs. requirements **Class'n:** major technical

Description

The Fundamental Assumptions of ISO 10303, the architecture, and the methodology, includes statement of the form: "XYZ is required". These are not assumptions - they are requirements. For example, the phrase "a) the complete exchange ... is required." written as an assumption would be "a) the complete ... is possible."

Proposed resolution:

- 1) Remove requirements and place them in a separate subclause (or separate document if not appropriate in Part 13.
- 2) Be clearer about requirements, e.g.,
 - a) Interoperability of applications through discrete file exchange
 - b) Interoperability of applications through access to a shared data repository.

Where Interoperability: the active creation and consumption of data by two or more applications that assign the same meaning to the data

Actual resolution:

This issue is addressed by the restructuring of clause 5 in N62.

Commentary

WG10/P1 Dallas: The current document reflects an incomplete consideration of the discussion between requirements and assumptions at the conclusion of the Grenoble meeting. This distinction will be further resolved at this time.

Implemented: N62 **Date resolved:** 03/01/96

Issue number:	261	Raised by:	Bill Burkett	Date:	20-Jan-96
Document N:	40	Clause(s):	5.1.2 (d)	Status:	open

Issue title: Reliability and efficiency **Class'n:** minor technical

Description

Reliability and efficiency should encompass the semantics - the computer resources and people's time to use the standard are fine measures, but if the message doesn't get across the action is useless.

Proposed resolution:

Actual resolution:

Commentary

Implemented: **Date resolved:**

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

Issue number:	262	Raised by:	Bill Burkett	Date:	20-Jan-96
Document N:	40	Clause(s):	5.1.2 (q) & others	Status:	closed

Issue title:	Archiving	Class'n:	minor technical
---------------------	-----------	-----------------	-----------------

Description

Archiving has always been mentioned among the things that STEP will be able to do, but there has never been any activity that pursued this objective. Is archiving done based on an AIM? Nobody has ever made this statement. Is an archive a compressed Part 21 file? Should there be a mapping to an archival format ala Part 21?

Proposed resolution:

Either remove the references to archiving or note that it is an objective that has not been fully addressed by STEP

Actual resolution:

5.1.2 (q) deleted from N62

Commentary

Implemented:	N62	Date resolved:	03/01/96
---------------------	-----	-----------------------	----------

Issue number:	263	Raised by:	Bill Burkett	Date:	20-Jan-96
Document N:	40	Clause(s):	5.2.2 (a) and (b)	Status:	closed

Issue title:	Division of the standard	Class'n:	major technical
---------------------	--------------------------	-----------------	-----------------

Description

It must be remembered that the partitioning of the standard is a design engineering solution to the problems addressed by STEP - division into classes isn't even a requirement!!! (Though it would be hard to imagine solving the step problem *without* subdividing the solution.) The assumption is that subdivision of the standard/architecture and components would aid in the development, usability, and understandability of the standard. Another assumption is that elements of the architecture can be functionally isolated (and developed) through the definition/specification of the interfaces that that element has with other elements of the architecture.

Proposed resolution:

Remove references to the partitioning or breakdown of the standard from assumptions, concepts and requirements. It is a solution approach, not a requirement

Actual resolution:

Text of 5.2.2 (b) is removed from N62.

Commentary

Implemented:	N63	Date resolved:	03/01/96
---------------------	-----	-----------------------	----------

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

Issue number:	264	Raised by:	Bill Burkett	Date:	20-Jan-96
Document N:	40	Clause(s):	5.2.2 (j)	Status:	open

Issue title: **Class'n:** major technical

Description

Upward and downward compatibility is mentioned in j) and other places. I agree that it an assumption, but an assumption of what? It's probably an assumption of the standard, but it's a new assumption. I don't recall *any* discussions about upward or downward compatibility since we left IGES behind. I don't believe this was ever an assumption of STEP.

Proposed resolution:

Remove references to upward/downward compatibility until a broader forum (WG10?) has discussed the issue and decided that this *is* in fact a desirable requirement for the standard. It certainly is not inherited from antiquit

Actual resolution:

Commentary

JPF: Text affected -- 5.1.2 (g) in N62 -- has been modified but does not address the issue fully. See also issue #176.

Implemented: **Date resolved:**

Issue number:	265	Raised by:	Bill Burkett	Date:	20-Jan-96
Document N:	40	Clause(s):	5.2.2 (l)	Status:	closed

Issue title: Minimal set of entities **Class'n:** major technical

Description

Not only is this a bad assumption, but exactly the opposite is true. A minimal set of entities *increases* the possibility of an ambiguous exchange.

Avoiding semantic redundancy reduces the number of entities required (not the other way around).

The value of reducing the size of the data specification remains to be seen. Vendors will assert that the fewer entities the better, but the cost is increased probability of ambiguity.

Proposed resolution:

Remove assumption. Please!

Actual resolution:

Statement removed, as proposed

Commentary

Implemented: N62 **Date resolved:** 03/01/96

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	266	<u>Raised by:</u>	Bill Burkett	<u>Date:</u>	20-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	5.2.2 (o)	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Separation of architectural elements	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
<u>Description</u> This assumption basically states: "we assume our design works". It isn't wrong, but is it necessary?			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u> Remove assumption.			
<u>Actual resolution:</u> Statement removed, as proposed.			
<u>Commentary</u>			
<u>Implemented:</u>	N62	<u>Date resolved:</u>	03/01/96

<u>Issue number:</u>	267	<u>Raised by:</u>	Bill Burkett	<u>Date:</u>	20-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	5.3.2 (b)	<u>Status:</u>	open

<u>Issue title:</u>	Interpretability of the standard	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
<u>Description</u> Reworded as an assumption (same change to a)): "a development methodology yields a standard that is interpretable by computers" is an assumption that I disagree with. It is the design of the standard and implementation of processors that make the data that conforms to the standard (correctly) interpretable by computers.			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u> change wording of a) and remove b)			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>			
<u>Commentary</u>			
<u>Implemented:</u>		<u>Date resolved:</u>	

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

Issue number:	268	Raised by:	Bill Burkett	Date:	20-Jan-96
Document N:	40	Clause(s):	5.3.2	Status:	open

Issue title:	Assumptions of the methodology	Class'n:	major technical
---------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------	-----------------

Description

Many/most of the assumptions listed in this clause are either assumptions of the architecture or of the standard (once the requirements are converted to assumptions, e.g., that “ f) implementations are testable” (pretty important assumption.)

I would have expected assumptions for the methodology to be like:

- 1) the architecture meets the requirements of ISO 10303
- 2) Integration and Interpretation require specialized skills that are not usually present within AP development teams.
- 3) Teams can work autonomously on different parts of the standard (or different classes or parts) and still achieve or produce a unified, consistent, and usable standard.

(This last is a poor assumption but, nevertheless, is one that we've been operating under for 10 years. It is most true across part classes. The truth to this assumption is attested to by the out-of-scope statements in Part 13; if the design of the standard doesn't address all aspects of the standard, then it is not a complete design!)

Proposed resolution:

Rethink the assumptions of the methodology and remove any related to the standard or the architecture.

Actual resolution:

Commentary

WG10/P1, Dallas: Item a), b), and c) are deleted as redundant with requirements introduced by issue 125.

Item d) becomes is deleted as undecipherable. A requirement item should be added to preserve traceability from data instance to the specification of that data in STEP standard.

Item e) is deleted as redundant (see redefined item i) in clause 5.1.2).

Item f) is an industry requirement on STEP.

Item g) is deleted. The requirement exists and its realization is documented in the body.

Item h) is deleted as redundant

Item i) is deleted as a simple statement of - do it right.

Item j) is deleted as a statement of fact. Therefore this or a corresponding statement should appear later in the body.

Item k) will be moved to 5.2.3 as the concepts relating to the use of formal language.

Items l), m) and n). A section shall be added after the architectural elaboration which maps all of the requirements for STEP (as moved to Part 1 and referenced here) to their satisfaction in the architecture. These items are moved to that section. The balance of the requirements need to be considered to complete this new section.

Implemented:	Date resolved:
---------------------	-----------------------

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	269	<u>Raised by:</u>	Bill Burkett	<u>Date:</u>	20-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	9	<u>Status:</u>	open
<hr/>					
<u>Issue title:</u>					<u>Class'n:</u> editorial
<u>Description</u>					
The second paragraph of clause 9 reads: “The ISO 10303 architecture is designed to support and facilitate the development of application protocols.” APs are *part* of the architecture - I don’t understand what this sentence is trying to say.					
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>					
Remove or rewrite.					
<u>Actual resolution:</u>					
<u>Commentary</u>					
<u>Implemented:</u>					
<u>Date resolved:</u>					
<hr/>					
<u>Issue number:</u>	270	<u>Raised by:</u>	Bill Burkett	<u>Date:</u>	20-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	9.4.1	<u>Status:</u>	accepted
<hr/>					
<u>Issue title:</u>	Incorrect clause numbering				<u>Class'n:</u> editorial
<u>Description</u>					
This clause should be an independent subclause, not a subclause of UoFs.					
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>					
Make it 9.5 and renumber others.					
<u>Actual resolution:</u>					
<u>Commentary</u>					
<u>Implemented:</u>					
<u>Date resolved:</u>					
<hr/>					
<u>Issue number:</u>	271	<u>Raised by:</u>	Bill Burkett	<u>Date:</u>	20-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	9.4.1	<u>Status:</u>	open
<hr/>					
<u>Issue title:</u>	Description of mapping table				<u>Class'n:</u> editorial
<u>Description</u>					
A mapping table provides mapping *between* the ARM objects and the AIM - not “from” and “to”. From/to terminology suggests that the mapping is directional. (Perhaps the text should say something to this effect - that the MT is either uni-directional or bi-directional.)					
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>					
Change wording					
<u>Actual resolution:</u>					
<u>Commentary</u>					
<u>Implemented:</u>					
<u>Date resolved:</u>					

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	272	<u>Raised by:</u>	Bill Burkett	<u>Date:</u>	20-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	9.5, example 15	<u>Status:</u>	open

<u>Issue title:</u>	SDAI and AIMs	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
----------------------------	---------------	------------------------	-----------------

Description

The use of SDAI has *nothing* to with an AIM. It depends solely on the EXPRESS language. SDAI can be used with any EXPRESS schema. Part 21, on the other hand, must be used in conjunction with an AIM. It may be the case that it is intended that SDAI will be used in conjunction with an AIM, but to my knowledge there is no such dependencies specified as part of the standard.

Proposed resolution:

Remove example or clarify how SDAI is to be used.

Actual resolution:

Commentary

This is Example 10 in N62.

<u>Implemented:</u>	<u>Date resolved:</u>
----------------------------	------------------------------

<u>Issue number:</u>	273	<u>Raised by:</u>	Bill Burkett	<u>Date:</u>	20-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	13	<u>Status:</u>	open

<u>Issue title:</u>	Scope of the ISO 10303 methodology	<u>Class'n:</u>	editorial
----------------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------	-----------

Description

“It covers all elements of the standard, ...” is an untrue statement. The methodology does not support the development of testing parts, of description method parts, or of implementation method parts.

Similarly confusing statements exist in this introductory clause. Note 1 seems to be contradictory to the first paragraph.

Proposed resolution:

Actual resolution:

Commentary

JPF: see also issues #215 and #227

<u>Implemented:</u>	<u>Date resolved:</u>
----------------------------	------------------------------

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	274	<u>Raised by:</u>	Bill Burkett	<u>Date:</u>	20-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	14	<u>Status:</u>	open
<u>Issue title:</u>	Additional definitions required				<u>Class'n:</u> editorial
<u>Description</u>	Clarification is needed over the terms method, methodology, procedure, and practice.				
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>	Add to definitions clause.				
<u>Actual resolution:</u>					
<u>Commentary</u>					
<u>Implemented:</u>	<u>Date resolved:</u>				
<u>Issue number:</u>	275	<u>Raised by:</u>	Bill Burkett	<u>Date:</u>	20-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	14.3	<u>Status:</u>	open
<u>Issue title:</u>	ARM validation				<u>Class'n:</u> minor technical
<u>Description</u>	The validation stuff described in the paragraphs immediately following note 2 sounds really great - but who is doing it? This doesn't reflect current practice, unfortunately. To my knowledge, this level of validation is practiced by almost no AP development team.				
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>	Remove text.				
<u>Actual resolution:</u>					
<u>Commentary</u>					
<u>Implemented:</u>	<u>Date resolved:</u>				
<u>Issue number:</u>	276	<u>Raised by:</u>	Bill Burkett	<u>Date:</u>	20-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	14.4	<u>Status:</u>	open
<u>Issue title:</u>	UOF/AAM relationship				<u>Class'n:</u> minor technical
<u>Description</u>	This list of UoFs and relationship to AAM is nice, but who does it? I've never seen or heard of such a list?				
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>					
<u>Actual resolution:</u>					
<u>Commentary</u>					
<u>Implemented:</u>	<u>Date resolved:</u>				

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	277	<u>Raised by:</u>	Bill Burkett	<u>Date:</u>	20-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	18.1 (a)	<u>Status:</u>	open

<u>Issue title:</u>	Three-layer architecture	<u>Class'n:</u>	major technical
----------------------------	--------------------------	------------------------	-----------------

Description

This assumption isn't clear. The "original (three-layer) architecture" is introduced out of the blue and should be omitted - it doesn't add anything. The sentence is awkward.

Proposed resolution:

If my interpretation is correct, the assumption should read something like:

"The data format of a discrete file can be determined based solely on the syntax of an EXPRESS schema without the consideration of the semantics of the EXPRESS schema."

A further assumptions which follows from this:

"The semantics of a data file that is created through syntactic mapping from an EXPRESS schema maintains precisely the same semantics specified in the schema." (which I think is an extremely important assumption about implementation!

Actual resolution:

Commentary

<u>Implemented:</u>	<u>Date resolved:</u>
----------------------------	------------------------------

<u>Issue number:</u>	278	<u>Raised by:</u>	Bill Burkett	<u>Date:</u>	20-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	18.1	<u>Status:</u>	open

<u>Issue title:</u>	Missing assumption	<u>Class'n:</u>	major technical
----------------------------	--------------------	------------------------	-----------------

Description

There is an important missing assumption about implementations:

"A unit of information can be equivalently represented (from a semantic perspective) by many different data formats."

Proposed resolution:

Actual resolution:

Commentary

<u>Implemented:</u>	<u>Date resolved:</u>
----------------------------	------------------------------

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

Issue number:	279	Raised by:	Bill Burkett	Date:	20-Jan-96
Document N:	40	Clause(s):	18.1 (b)	Status:	open

Issue title:	"Efficiency" of data	Class'n:	editorial
---------------------	----------------------	-----------------	-----------

Description

"Data" isn't efficient - data doesn't "do" anything and, therefore, cannot exhibit characteristics of "efficiency". Characteristics of this kind are exhibited by actions, activities, or procedures. An application may be said to be more efficient or less efficient depending on the organization of the data that it processes.

(Besides, this is a requirement, not an assumption.)

Proposed resolution:

Remove text

Actual resolution:

Commentary

Implemented:	Date resolved:
---------------------	-----------------------

Issue number:	280	Raised by:	Bill Burkett	Date:	20-Jan-96
Document N:	40	Clause(s):	18.2 (c)	Status:	open

Issue title:	Mapping of EXPRESS to implementation form	Class'n:	major technical
---------------------	---	-----------------	-----------------

Description

I strongly disagree with this "fundamental concept" (it's really more of an assumption, anyway!)

ALL features of EXPRESS are relevant for an implementation method - I can't imagine the contrary. It may be that an implementation chooses to ignore or cannot do anything with a particular feature of EXPRESS, but that does not mean it is irrelevant. As a matter of fact, that feature that can't be handled is all the more important because it is not handled because it represents something that is lost between what is said in an EXPRESS schema and the implementation. (The example about comments is so trivial that it doesn't merit mention.

Proposed resolution:

Remove concept (c)

Actual resolution:

Commentary

Implemented:	Date resolved:
---------------------	-----------------------

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	281	<u>Raised by:</u>	Bill Burkett	<u>Date:</u>	20-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	18.1 (d)	<u>Status:</u>	open

<u>Issue title:</u>	Mapping from EXPRESS is deterministic	<u>Class'n:</u>	editorial
----------------------------	---------------------------------------	------------------------	-----------

Description

“deducation” is not something that happens when looking at a schema and trying to figure out what the data file will look like. It is deterministic: if the schema looks like X, then per mapping and syntax of Part 21, the data file will look like xx.

Proposed resolution:

Reword fundamental concept as follows:

“Given a mapping from each feature of EXPRESS to a physical data format, the conformance of data to an AIM can be assessed.

Actual resolution:

Commentary

Implemented: **Date resolved:**

<u>Issue number:</u>	282	<u>Raised by:</u>	Bill Burkett	<u>Date:</u>	20-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	18.4.1.1	<u>Status:</u>	open

<u>Issue title:</u>	Use of banking example	<u>Class'n:</u>	editorial
----------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	-----------

Description

The banking example and analogy is introduced out of the blue. The flow in this section needs to be smoothed out a bit and edited.

Proposed resolution:

Actual resolution:

Commentary

Implemented: **Date resolved:**

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	283	<u>Raised by:</u>	Bill Burkett	<u>Date:</u>	20-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	18.4.1.1, last para	<u>Status:</u>	open
<hr/>					
<u>Issue title:</u>	Role of AIM in establishing context for exchange				<u>Class'n:</u> minor technical
<u>Description</u>					
The sentence “It is the application interpreted model which provides a documented explanation of the context (scope) and meaning (relationships) of the data to be exchanged.” is not true. The AIM does not do this, but rather the AP as a whole. The AIM only specifies the data structure and some of the meaning. Much of the meaning comes from the mapping to the ARM.					
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>					
<u>Actual resolution:</u>					
<u>Commentary</u>					
<u>Implemented:</u>		<u>Date resolved:</u>			
<hr/>					
<u>Issue number:</u>	284	<u>Raised by:</u>	Bill Burkett	<u>Date:</u>	20-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	18.4.3	<u>Status:</u>	open
<hr/>					
<u>Issue title:</u>	Open data and ISO 10303				<u>Class'n:</u> editorial
<u>Description</u>					
I don’t think this clause contributes to the understanding of STEP or the documentation of the methods/architecture of the standard.					
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>					
Delete clause					
<u>Actual resolution:</u>					
<u>Commentary</u>					
<u>Implemented:</u>		<u>Date resolved:</u>			
<hr/>					
<u>Issue number:</u>	285	<u>Raised by:</u>	Bill Burkett	<u>Date:</u>	20-Jan-96
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	18.5.1	<u>Status:</u>	open
<hr/>					
<u>Issue title:</u>	Satisfaction of ATS				<u>Class'n:</u> minor technical
<u>Description</u>					
Third list item should be deleted. Conforming implementations do not produce instances that “satisfy” abstract test suites. Abstract test suites are used to test conformance.					
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>					
Remove list item					
<u>Actual resolution:</u>					
<u>Commentary</u>					
<u>Implemented:</u>		<u>Date resolved:</u>			

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

Issue number:	286	Raised by:	WG10/P1 Dallas	Date:	23-Jan-96
Document N:	40	Clause(s):	7	Status:	accepted

Issue title: Figure 3 requires update **Class'n:** minor technical

Description

Figure 3 has missing elements and does not characterise the elements by the major divisions of the architecture

Proposed resolution:

Update figure 3 to include:

- * mapping table
- * revised text for relationships to ATS

Add a second diagram that adds an overlay showing how the architecture is partitioned into its major elements - data architecture, description methods, implementation methods, conformance testing methods. This figure should precede figure 3, showing the elements of the architecture and their aggregation, but not their interrelationships. Titles of these diagrams are "Elements of the ISO 10303 architecture" and "Relationships between the elements of the ISO 10303 architecture".

Actual resolution:

Commentary

See issue #287 for terminology discussion.

Implemented: **Date resolved:**

Issue number:	287	Raised by:	WG10/P1	Date:	23-Jan-96
Document N:	40	Clause(s):	6	Status:	transferred

Issue title: Naming of architectural elements **Class'n:** minor technical

Description

Section 6 identifies the elements of the architecture as data architecture, implementation methods, description methods. The use of the term "method" is inappropriate for an architectural component.

Proposed resolution:

Replace with:

- * data specification architecture
- * data specification languages
- * data access architecture
- * conformance testing framework

Actual resolution:

Commentary

Clearly an issue to refer to Part !

Implemented: **Date resolved:** 01/23/96

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	288	<u>Raised by:</u>	Matthew West	<u>Date:</u>	21-Dec-95
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	3.6.8 NOTE 1	<u>Status:</u>	open

<u>Issue title:</u>	Dependency and Modularisation	<u>Class'n:</u>	major technical
----------------------------	-------------------------------	------------------------	-----------------

Description

It is not the case that modelling dependencies is consistent with modularisation. Existence dependency is not the same as data dependency. Forcing existence dependence prevents the use of structures that appropriately only reflect data dependence at a la

Proposed resolution:

Delete sentence

Actual resolution:

Commentary

JPF: Issue text is incomplete as received from author. Text affected is 15.1.13 in N62.

Implemented:

Date resolved:

<u>Issue number:</u>	289	<u>Raised by:</u>	Matthew West	<u>Date:</u>	21-Dec-95
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	5.1.2 Note 3	<u>Status:</u>	open

<u>Issue title:</u>	Data Sharing	<u>Class'n:</u>	major technical
----------------------------	--------------	------------------------	-----------------

Description

After the first 3 sentences, none of the statements are necessarily true. You do not require an analogous context to data exchange for data sharing. The context does not have to be dependent on the enterprise in which product data sharing is taking place.

Proposed resolution:

Delete offending sentence.

Actual resolution:

Commentary

JPF: text affected is Note 4 in N62

Implemented:

Date resolved:

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	290	<u>Raised by:</u>	Matthew West	<u>Date:</u>	21-Dec-95
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	5.1.3, Note 3	<u>Status:</u>	open

<u>Issue title:</u>	Support for Data Sharing	<u>Class'n:</u>	major technical
----------------------------	--------------------------	------------------------	-----------------

Description

This note claims much more than can be substantiated. The STEP methodology and architecture are not designed to support data sharing. They do not specify the implementation of data sharing.

Proposed resolution:

Replace note with "In as much that data exchange is an element of data sharing, ISO 10303 can be said to support data sharing."

Actual resolution:

Commentary

Implemented:

Date resolved:

<u>Issue number:</u>	291	<u>Raised by:</u>	Matthew West	<u>Date:</u>	21-Dec-95
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	5.2.2 (e), (f), (g)	<u>Status:</u>	closed

<u>Issue title:</u>	Not an Assumption	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
----------------------------	-------------------	------------------------	-----------------

Description

Is e) really an assumption, or a statement of the obvious? f) is not stated as an assumption, but as a consequence of e). Thus it is not an assumption as it should be in this section. Further, it is not a necessary consequence of not knowing the precise d

Proposed resolution:

delete e), delete "therefore". In f) and replace "feasible" with "practicable", replace "such" with "all". In g) replace "feasible" with "practicable".

Actual resolution:

Addressed by restructuring of clause 5 in N62

Commentary

JPF: Issue text is incomplete as received from author

Implemented:

N62

Date resolved:

03/01/96

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	292	<u>Raised by:</u>	Matthew West	<u>Date:</u>	21-Dec-95
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	18.4.2, 18.5	<u>Status:</u>	open

<u>Issue title:</u>	Inappropriate Content for a Normative Document	<u>Class'n:</u>	major technical
----------------------------	--	------------------------	-----------------

Description

18.4.2 and 18.5 belong in a discussion document on how the STEP methodology could be developed. They are not part of the current methodology. I have a host of specific issues against the material if it is presented in a more appropriate place. The only p

Proposed resolution:

Replace by "The current available and planned parts of ISO 10303 support the exchange of data according to a single Application Protocol and the access by a single user of a single application to data stored according to a single Application Protocol."

Actual resolution:

Commentary

JPF: Issue text is incomplete as received from author

Implemented:

Date resolved:

<u>Issue number:</u>	293	<u>Raised by:</u>	Matthew West	<u>Date:</u>	21-Dec-95
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	Annex B, para. 1	<u>Status:</u>	open

<u>Issue title:</u>	Level of abstraction	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
----------------------------	----------------------	------------------------	-----------------

Description

Sentence 2 states that "The integrated resources constitute a generic model of product data and are more abstract than the product data on which applications operate." This is at least not my experience. I know of more than one application that deals wit

Proposed resolution:

Delete "and are more abstract than the product data on which applications operate."

Actual resolution:

Commentary

JPF: Issue text is incomplete as received from author

Implemented:

Date resolved:

ISO 10303-13 Architecture and methodology reference manual -- issues log (WG10 N41)

<u>Issue number:</u>	294	<u>Raised by:</u>	Matthew West	<u>Date:</u>	21-Dec-95
<u>Document N:</u>	40	<u>Clause(s):</u>	D.3.2, 1st sentence	<u>Status:</u>	open

<u>Issue title:</u>	Unclear statement	<u>Class'n:</u>	minor technical
<u>Description</u>			
I don't understand the first sentence.			
<u>Proposed resolution:</u>			
Delete			
<u>Actual resolution:</u>			
<u>Commentary</u>			
<u>Implemented:</u>	<u>Date resolved:</u>		